LIBRARY
Brigham Young University

FROM

Call No. 232.9 H26 V.1

Acc. No. 219436

AID

6. Vols

850
C

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

https://archive.org/details/historyofjesusof01kei1876

232.9
R26
V.1

Prospectus of the

THEOLOGICAL TRANSLATION FUND.

As it is important that the best results of recent theological investigations on the Continent, conducted without reference to doctrinal considerations, and with the sole purpose of arriving at truth, should be placed within the reach of English readers, it is proposed to collect, by Subscriptions and Donations, a Fund which shall be employed for the promotion of this object. A good deal has been already effected in the way of translating foreign theological literature, a series of works from the pens of Hengstenberg, Haevernick, Delitzsch, Keil, and others of the same school, having of late years been published in English, but—as the names of the authors just mentioned will at once suggest to those who are conversant with the subject—the tendency of these works is for the most part conservative. It is a theological literature of a more independent character, less biassed by dogmatical prepossessions, a literature which is represented by such works as those of Ewald, Hupfeld, F. C. Baur, Zeller, Rothe, Keim, Schrader, Hausrath, Nöldeke, Pfleiderer, &c., in Germany, and by those of Kuenen, Scholten, and others, in Holland, that it is desirable to render accessible to English readers who are not familiar with the languages of the Continent. The demand for works of this description is not as yet so widely extended among either the clergy or the laity of Great Britain as to render it practicable for publishers to bring them out in any considerable numbers at their own risk. And for this reason

219436

the publication of treatises of this description can only be secured by obtaining the co-operation of the friends of free and unbiassed theological inquiry.

It is hoped that at least such a number of Subscribers of *One Guinea Annually* may be obtained as may render it practicable for the Publishers, as soon as the scheme is fairly set on foot, to bring out every year *three 8vo volumes*, which each Subscriber of the above amount would be entitled to receive gratis. But as it will be necessary to obtain, and to remunerate, the services of a responsible Editor, and in general, if not invariably, to pay the translators, it would conduce materially to the speedy success of the design, if free donations were also made to the Fund; or if contributors were to subscribe for more than one copy of the works to be published.

If you approve of this scheme, you are requested to communicate with Messrs. Williams and Norgate, 14, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London, and to state whether you are willing to subscribe; and if you are disposed to assist further, what would be the amount of your donation, or the number of additional copies of the publications which you would take.

We are, your obedient servants,

JOHN TULLOCH,	H. J. S. SMITH,
H. B. WILSON,	H. SIDGWICK,
B. JOWETT,	JAMES HEYWOOD,
A. P. STANLEY,	C. KEGAN PAUL,
W. G. CLARK,	J. ALLANSON PICTON,
S. DAVIDSON,	ROBT. WALLACE,
JAMES MARTINEAU,	LEWIS CAMPBELL,
JOHN CAIRD,	RUSSELL MARTINEAU,
EDWARD CAIRD,	T. K. CHEYNE,
JAMES DONALDSON,	J. MUIR.

The number of Subscribers is as yet far from that required to cover the cost of the undertaking. But it is hoped that a considerable accession will accrue as soon as the progress of the scheme is further advanced.

A Committee selected from the signataries of the original Prospectus agreed upon the works to commence the series. Of these, the following were published in

The *First* Year's (1873) Subscription:

Keim (Th.), History of Jesus of Nazara. Considered in its connection with the National Life of Israel, and related in detail. Second Edition, re-translated by Arthur Ransom. Vol. I.

Baur (F. C.), Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, his Life and Work, his Epistles and Doctrine. A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity. Second Edition, by Rev. Allan Menzies. Vol. I.

Kuenen (A.), The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State. Translated by A. H. May. Vol. I.

The *Second* Year's (1874) volumes consist of—

Kuenen's Religion of Israel. Vol. II. Translated by A. H. May.

Baur's Paul; the second and concluding volume. Translated by the Rev. Allan Menzies; and,

Bleek's Lectures on the Apocalypse. Edited by the Rev. Dr. S. Davidson.

The *Third* Year (1875) embraces—

Kuenen's Religion of Israel; the third and concluding volume.

Ewald's Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament. Translated by the Rev. J. Frederick Smith. Vol. I.

Zeller, The Acts of the Apostles critically examined. To which is prefixed, Overbeck's Introduction from De Wette's Handbook, translated by Joseph Dare, B.A. (in 2 vols.). Vol. I.

The *Fourth* Year (1876) will consist of—

Zeller's Acts of the Apostles. Vol. II. and last.

Keim's History of Jesus of Nazara. Vol. II. Translated by the Rev. E. M. Geldart.

Ewald's Prophets of the Old Testament. Vol. II.

Beyond these, the following Works are in the hands of Translators, and will be included in the next years' Subscriptions:

Baur's First Three Centuries of the Christian Church.

A Short Protestant Commentary on the New Testament; including Introductions to the Books, by Lipsius, Holsten, Lang, Pfleiderer, Holtzmann, Hilgenfeld, and others.

Hausrath's History of the New Testament Times. Translated by the Rev. C. J. Poynting.

Pfleiderer's Paulinismus.

The Third Volume of Keim's History of Jesus, translated by A. Ransom; and

The following Volumes of Ewald's Prophets, translated by the Rev. J. Frederick Smith.

As a means of increasing the number of Subscribers, it has been suggested to us that many of the present supporters will probably be able to furnish us with lists of persons of liberal thought, to whom we would send the Prospectus. We shall thankfully receive such lists.

WILLIAMS & NORGATE.

14, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden,
London, W.C.

v.1

THE HISTORY

OF

JESUS OF NAZARA,

FREELY INVESTIGATED

IN ITS CONNECTION WITH THE NATIONAL LIFE OF ISRAEL,

AND RELATED IN DETAIL.

BY

DR. THEODOR KEIM.

TRANSLATED BY ARTHUR RANSOM.

VOL. I.

SECOND EDITION.

21943b

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,

14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;

AND 20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

1876.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. GREEN AND SON,
178, STRAND.

NOTICE BY THE EDITOR.

THIS second English edition of the introductory volume of Dr. Keim's History of Jesus is virtually a re-translation, though in some places the former translation has not been departed from more than was necessary. The text differs from that of the original only in the omission of two or three purely personal references, of no interest to English readers. The notes have been for the most part preserved.

The second volume, translated by the Rev. E. M. Geldart, of Liverpool, is now in the press, and will shortly appear. The third volume, translated by Mr. Arthur Ransom, will be placed in the hands of the printer immediately.

CORRIGENDA.

Page 6, line 10 from top, for "individuality," read "singularity."
" 7, " 18 " insert "way" after "whatever."

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

EDITOR'S NOTICE iii

PREFACE vii

INTRODUCTION: SURVEY OF SOURCES 1

1. The Author's Undertaking 3

2. Ways and Means 10

PRE-CHRISTIAN SOURCES 12

1. Jewish Sources 12

2. Heathen Sources 24

CHRISTIAN SOURCES 34

1. Christian Sources outside the New Testament . . 34

2. New Testament 48

A. The Testimony of Paul 48

B. The Four Gospels 59

I.—The Three First Gospels 61

A. Matthew 62

α. The Gospel as a Whole . . . 64

β. Internal Discrepancies . . . 75

γ. Degree of Credibility . . . 86

B. Luke 95

α. Time and Place 95

β. Sources 97

γ. Aim and Plan 105

δ. Credibility 111

PAGE

C. Mark 114
α. Date 114
β. Sources 117
γ. Spirit, Aim, and Plan . . . 123
δ. Historical Value 132
ε. The present Controversy . . . 137
II.—The Gospel of John 141
α. Aim of the Book 142
β. Dogmatic Character 148
γ. Form 156
δ. Sources 160
ε. Historical Character 166
ζ. Date 186
η. Author 211
First Part.—The Sacred Ground-work . . . 233
Division I. The Political Ground-work . . . 233
Division II. The Religious Ground-work . . . 276
Section 1. The Jewish Illumination. Philo the Alexandrian 276
Section 2. Religion in the Holy Land . . . 296
Section 3. The Messianic Expectation . . . 314
Section 4. The Religious Communities in the Holy Land . 327
I.—The Pharisees and Sadducees . . . 327
1. The Pharisees 329
2. The Sadducees 353
Section 5. The Separatists in the Holy Land . . 365
II.—The Essenes 365

PREFACE TO THE FIRST (GERMAN) VOLUME.

When I was urged by highly esteemed men of science and of the Church, at home and abroad, to apply myself to the task of writing the history of Jesus, I felt both inclined and disinclined to engage in such a work. My predilection for this great department of history was decades old, as old as my student days; while my academical vocation had placed me in the border-land between the New Testament and the history of the Church. At intervals since 1860, in what was still the dawn of the new Christological agitation, yet before the infection of writing had widely spread, I had produced a series of discourses on the life of Jesus. But of late, much distorting passion has been unmistakably exhibited in this department. Right and left, men unanimously demand, not researches, but results, not history, but dogmas, and what is distasteful is suppressed or mishandled. It must be left to the yet unborn historian of the theology of the present age to give a correct account of this state of things. The man who loves rest and quietness, honour and respect, not to mention temporal favour, must consider, not merely whether he is willing to suffer, but also whether he is prepared to embitter his life, or, by humiliating compliance, to do violence to his conscience. When one finds that, in this history, in consequence of the greatness of its subject and the condition of its sources, the historical person of Jesus cannot exist altogether independent of hypothesis, and that that historical person with the hypothesis itself, though apparently inti-

mately related to the dogmas of both right and left, in reality is only vulnerable by their shafts, it may seem advisable to turn towards other departments of history in which there is peace, and which allow of exact treatment. I have myself felt the force of these considerations. In the midst of friendly greetings of welcome, violent opposition has not been wanting. I have been met, on the one hand, by the knights-errant of principle, who altogether fail to understand the historical edifice, and who wax warm over inconsistencies due to their own misconceptions; and, on the other hand, by the apostles of sentiment, who are keen in their appreciation of colour, but obtuse in their recognition of scientific achievement.

My love for the cause, and the sense of duty belonging to my vocation, have yielded to no deterring influences. I believed myself to possess at least two qualifications necessary to justify me in offering a modest contribution to the solution of the eternal problem of Christendom, nay, of humanity itself,—viz. some degree of historical insight and impartiality. As to the first point, I have the consciousness of engaging in this work as one who is not altogether a novice, but has passed through a tolerably long probation in this and in other, reluctantly abandoned, provinces of history; and with all the imperfection of a first execution in the midst of little leisure, my performance will so far speak for itself, that the comprehensive employment of historical facts and documents as the basis of the life of Jesus, when compared with what has been done by my predecessors, will be recognized. Among those predecessors—besides Hase, Schenkel, and Weizsäcker, authors of well-known works—I also give special prominence to Ewald, the master in Old Testament history, from whom I have learnt orally as well as by means of his writings, and from whose presentation of our subject mine is distinguished—apart from critical differences—merely by the simple fact that to him, as a natural consequence of his comprehensive plan, the history of Jesus is but a part of the history of Israel; while to me, in my less extensive and more intensive

task, the same life of Jesus has become the focus into which are gathered the brightest lights of Israel. As to the second point, I cannot, it is true, pretend to have attained altogether to Strauss' freedom from presupposition. I, like so many kindred minds in Germany and Switzerland, have not sacrificed my heart's interest in the religious sphere of Christianity to a cold neutrality-standpoint, the very neutrality of which becomes the rallying-point of a party, and which, in the case of Strauss, in spite of a perceptible, indeed successful, striving after calm objectivity, has emerged from its chrysalis in the form of a predilection for philosophical presuppositions. On the contrary, I believe that in me are to be found submissiveness and freedom, religion and a pursuit of truth regardless of consequences, in such a state of equilibrium that neither yields to the special-pleading of the other, neither dominates the other; and that, by their equable adjustment, justice is more fully done to the truth itself. That the old and ready reproaches of hermaphroditism, incongruous combination, and contradiction, which have ever been heaped upon strictly undogmatic history, will be repeated, is a necessity springing from the nature of man, from variety of standpoints, from the difficulties of the subject, and from the shortcomings of the workman. I hope, nevertheless, that my readers will be satisfied with facts with or without comment; that they will not weaken the force of laborious proofs by sarcasm; and that they will not require me to lend an ear to objections which pretentiously reproduce upon the stage questions long since decided.

I have little to add concerning the details of this work. To speak first of the title, a reluctance to excite a smile by awakening a reminiscence of Venturini, could not hinder me from designating Jesus by the name hallowed by both the New Testament and history. My conception of him is not to be measured by his town; and I might perhaps have written "History of the Lord," had I been able to endure confessions at the corners of streets and on title-pages. I have written Nazara, not for

the sake of innovation, but because it does not befit a scientific work to sell itself to traditions. It may be detected that the discussion concerning the Gospel question, though it stands first, was written last, and in the midst of fatigue. Yet it is not simply on account of a crippled power of concentration, but designedly, that the investigation concerning the fourth Gospel, the most critical inquiry of all, occupies as much space as those concerning the other three Gospels put together. Non-theological readers may unhesitatingly pass over these inquiries, although, both here and elsewhere, I have taken some pains to interest them. The synoptical table does not claim to be complete: space was wanting for this, especially as to the sayings, and also in the history of the Passion, where detail was necessary, and on this account I reserve a synoptical table of the latter for a future volume; yet I trust that what I have given, throwing fresh light on the most important differences, will to some extent help the reader to acquire an exact conception of the ground-plan of the Gospels. I have not uttered my last word on the Gospel question,—at least as to the sources of the Synoptics. Upon many points, greater detail was necessary than was here possible; as to others, I have discovered, while the volume was going through the press, several new features,—as particularly in the Ebionite source of Luke, in which I have been led to suspect a variety of the Gospel of the Hebrews. The fourth fascicle of Hilgenfeld's work on the Extra-Canonical Gospels (1866) did not reach me until the printing of my work was far advanced. I fully appreciate the value of this learned performance; but on the whole I abide firmly by my conclusions, and am not prepared to recognize in the Gospel of the Hebrews, in praise of which Hilgenfeld now speaks louder than ever, the "Archimedean point" and the "root" of all the Gospels. It seems to me that, among other things, the ascent of Tabor by Jesus literally suspended from a hair, the rich man scratching in his hair, as well as the mason with the withered hand, who considers begging unseemly, are

only calculated to give the impression of a childishly comic originality. I may yet have time to examine these questions in detail. The antagonistic positions which I have here and there taken up even against such men as Holtzmann and Weizsäcker, who in the province of the Gospels stand near me, may be modified by the explanations of those who are concerned: I hold myself in readiness to receive instruction, and also to meet attacks. Should it be found that, in the Gospel controversy, I am upon some points more at one than his school with the deceased Tübingen theologian, whose greatness is now, after trivial depreciation, fully recognized, it can be to me only a source of delight that I am erecting to him, with whom in never-to-be-forgotten hours I have conversed on the life of the Lord, this memorial, which perhaps is the more valuable that no reasonable person can detect in me a reliance upon authority or a party tendency.

I have often found it necessary to refer back from the New Testament to the Old. The latter is not specially my province, but my subject forbad timidity. I have sought to learn, and yet have frequently failed. I crave the indulgence of those into whose domains I have trespassed: indeed, they must accord an indemnity until they themselves open to us the doors from the Old Testament into the New more freely and fully. For the later times of Judaism, I have made copious use of Philo and Josephus. I have not yet been able to devote my time to the Talmud; in this province, therefore, I have followed the recognized compilers with less reserve than Ewald. I have made independent researches only at the beginning and end: I have frequently quoted the Pirke Abot, and the mediæval Sepher Toledot has at least passed through my hands while my book was going through the press. If I am permitted to enlarge my labours in this department, my sources on this point will also be enlarged.

I await the verdict of my impartial contemporaries upon this work; the final sentence, however, cannot be pronounced until I have finished the whole, the porch only of which I have yet

opened, and towards whose purely historical part, which rises superior to myth and hypothesis, I myself press forward with eager longing. It is also my intention, henceforth, to dispense with much of the ballast I have hitherto used in my anxious determination to estimate correctly the very least thing in the history of the greatest person,—a determination which certainly has had this result, that the book cannot be charged, even by opponents, with being addressed to the masses. If strength, time, and space permit, the remainder of the work, which I purpose issuing as quickly as possible in small instalments, shall contain a brief history of this branch of science, which the limits of the Introduction did not allow of in the first volume. To those who have aided me in my work, especially to my dear and honoured colleagues, Hitzig, Schweizer, Fritzsche, Schrader, Büdinger, and Bursian, I here tender my heartfelt thanks: I promise the same gratitude to all who, by their expressions in public and in private, will be so friendly as to exhibit towards the book, and yet more towards the cause of truth, the interest of impartiality and justice.

TH. KEIM.

Zurich, May, 1867.

INTRODUCTION.

SURVEY OF SOURCES.

INTRODUCTION.

SURVEY OF SOURCES.

I.—The Author's Undertaking.

The life of Jesus is a biography which, like no other, opens out into a great and long national history—nay, into the history of the world itself. It is the biography of an individual; but that individual is a man who, in the first place, in the elevation of his self-consciousness and of his spiritual energy, is a symptom of universal history, and veritably a new stage in the development of the human mind; and who, in the second place, by means of scarcely more than a single year's activity, became the creator of a new and higher Kosmos, the duration of which is to be reckoned by millenniums, and the extent of which is to be conterminous with the whole surface of the earth.[1]

Thus, from every point of view, to write a history of the life of Jesus is to undertake a difficult task. First of all, it is the pleasant duty of such a history to display lovingly and ungrudgingly the wealth of the individual *facts* of this life. It can perform this duty with a glad heart, in spite of the many vexed questions which must be left undecided or passed by in silence for lack of evidence: so long as it finds some stable facts, it

[1] Origen, *De Princ.* 4, 5: Indicium autem effusæ gratiæ in labiis ejus hoc est, quod brevi tempore transacto (anno enim et aliquot mensibus docuit) universus tamen orbis doctrina et fide pietatis ejus impletus est.

advances securely and joyfully upon golden ground. But so surely as it is called, and is resolved to be, history, it is not satisfied with merely gathering up the scattered current facts, and arranging them, after earlier models, in some tolerable order, whether of time or of subject-matter; it is constrained to seek in the facts for the kernel which cannot be touched and grasped by the senses, but can be discerned, seized, comprehended only by the mind,—namely, the essential character of the man, of his self-consciousness, of what he willed and of what he wrought. This history must also penetrate the facts and discover their ground, must tell us *why* the man became what he was in his nation, in his age, in history, and *why*, moreover, the humanity of the past and that also of to-day, the humanity which is the heir of former needs and of former gains, has irrevocably fastened its faith and love upon this person. He who forces his way through the facts to their kernel, he who penetrates them to their ground, even he may make miscalculations concerning lesser men, much more concerning him who saw above and beyond the range of earthly vision. He who, fully expecting here as elsewhere to build in an historical field, seriously examines the kernel and the foundation, and, applying the points of view and standards of ordinary history, employs a definite terminology,—who delineates a man with human gifts and powers, a human development of receptivity, striving and growing, human dependence upon family, race, nation and time; finally, human relationships, not only in growth and development, but also in becoming the object of faith by means of congenial mutually-attracted minds,—such an one is in danger, in the first place, of sketching the proportions of this new life after old and far too diminutive models, and, in the next place, of not satisfying, or only half satisfying, with his results those whose commission he is executing.

This history has had to meet a double demand. The science of history in the broadest sense, on the one hand, and the Church on the other, are both deeply interested in the demand for a

genuinely historical biography of Jesus. For the science of history in general, the necessity of possessing exact information concerning the life of Jesus is pressing in proportion as it is impossible for universal history to turn away with indifference from any of the formative impulses of the human mind, especially from the manifestations of the religious spirit, the culture-bearer of the nations, and most of all from the world-stirring motive-power which made its appearance in Christianity. A universal history which maintained an attitude of indifference or exclusiveness towards the appearance of Christianity upon the world's stage, and degraded it to a mere appendage to the sorrowful spectacles accompanying the dissolution of Judaism, or to the follies of the period of the Roman Emperors, would be a mockery of history. Still more directly, more urgently, does the Christian Church demand the most minutely exact, the most completely reliable account of the original and actual character of its Founder. It has long been acknowledged that no religion depends upon the person of its Founder so fully as the Christian religion. In other instances, faith is based chiefly upon the founder's teaching, but here rather upon a life, in which men have found not merely a voice from heaven, but a divine advent. No branch of the Christian community awaits and demands an answer more impatiently than Protestantism. It has sacrificed all the mediatorial saints to this one person: is there salvation in his name? It has renounced all the later, pretentious, garrulous traditions in favour of the Bible and the Gospels: what, then, do the Gospels say, and is what they say really anything more than doubtful tradition? Thus Science and the Church are unitedly occupied with the one problem, the attempt to recover the historical life of Jesus. They convert their problem into a commission. This commission to narrate the life of Jesus is entrusted to the theological section of historical inquiry, a branch both of the general science of history and of the literature of the Church that seeks a scientific basis or a scientific justification. Those who impose the commission only reserve to themselves

the right of accepting or rejecting the obtained solution, as consistent with, or contradictory to, their principles, and, should the solution be rejected, of proposing the question afresh.

United as Science and the Church are in demanding an historical life of Jesus, they appear to be quite as much at issue in their principles, and therefore to differ widely in all their verdicts upon the results offered to them. The fundamental law of historical science, even with reference to the life of Jesus, is uninterrupted sequence; the watchword of the Church, isolation: there, organic articulation; here, individuality: there, a human, here, a divine, personality. According to Science, the life of Jesus stands in the great current of the world's history; he is a human individuality, the product of the ideas and facts of his age, and, a mighty sweeping billow in the world's history, raised by the conflict of all the forces of his time, is destined to subside again into the level sea, in order, in the restless play of human things, after having been peacefully absorbed into the common life of humanity, to make room for new and mightier developments and upheavals. According to the Church, he is the rock which dominates the current; the rock is not the product of the current—a more than volcanic, a creative, power has thrown it up; the current cannot wash over it, cannot overflow it, cannot rise above it; that rock, the pillar, the Son of God, will look down upon humanity, however far it may flow and however high it may rise, and will for ever permit that humanity only either to hold fast by him or to break itself in pieces against him. Here we have irreconcilable contradictions, with no prospect of a mutual understanding; and in the presence of such contradictions, the commission to write a life of Jesus becomes void, or must be returned to those from whom it was received, that each party may find its own solution.

These contradictions, however, have, especially in our day, been toned down and weakened. Science itself has to some degree given up its levelling operations, by which it degraded the great characters of history in favour of the many and the

little. At the very moment when the newer philosophy, the fashioner of that world of conceptions upon which our century has hitherto subsisted, converted the universe and universal history into a movement of thought (*Denkbewegung*), in which the necessary and ever-ascending process of thought threatened to transform the architects of history into more or less dispensable assistants of the Idea, Hegel, the highest expression of this tendency, compelled, in spite of his system, to pay homage to the great powers of history, uttered the often-quoted saying: At the head of all that takes place, therefore of all that belongs to universal history, stand individuals. And at the very time when his greatest disciple, Strauss, was preparing, nay, had effected, the sacrifice of the historical Christ to the higher and alone authorized Idea, he was compelled, against all consistency, to proclaim the historical Christ as the perfect, supreme, unsurpassable pillar of religion,—an admission, indeed, which he has since, with or without consistency, retracted. We owe yet another gain to Hegel. He broke down—in whatever he may have done it—the stiff and rigid antithesis between God and man, and thereby, at the same time, the stiff and rigid adherence to a *merely* human Christ such as the Kantian philosophy of the time was partial to, but the Church cannot endure; and, with his disciple, he found it possible, credible, that in the person of Jesus a presentiment and sure consciousness of oneness with God dawned upon the human race, and upon Jesus himself with a force powerful enough to fill the whole of his life. Influenced by Schelling, Schleiermacher yet more powerfully advanced the claims of the special and—even in the logic of universal history—creative personality. And, yet once more, the scientific research of to-day in all departments, influenced by the spirit of modern natural science, which listens to facts and bases ideas upon facts, not facts upon ideas, is disposed to attach to the world of things, therefore to the great characters of universal history, no other name than that which they make for themselves by their operation and achievements.

But the Church also, on the other side, has moderated its requirements. An increasingly urgent demand for a human Jesus of Nazareth is extorted from the theologian by the New Testament difficulties, and by the notional difficulties of the old doctrine concerning Christ. A similar demand is extorted from the simply religious member of the Church by the general revolution of sentiment, and by the enhanced estimate of the dignity of humanity—an estimate based upon modern culture, upon a deeper insight into human nature, upon the long course of historical achievements, and, not least, upon the elevating facts of the life of Jesus, and his spirit-stirring appeals. The human Jesus is the watchword of the age, to which even the stanchest advocates of a Son of God are beginning to accommodate themselves. There is a reversal of sentiment. Satisfied with seeing a human face in Jesus, men formerly recognized the pledges of man's salvation, redemption, and future glory, only in his divine nature, in the certainty of his having come down from heaven, in his pure unprogressive perfection, in his miracles, resurrection, and ascension. To-day, men are happy if this mysterious and ever sublime character strengthens and multiplies the evidences of his genuinely human origin, of his brotherly fellowship, of a development of the same nature as our own; instead of being alarmed, men find it quite natural when his mind toils painfully, when from time to time he falls back upon the conclusions of his spiritual predecessors, when his struggling will bleeds, when the very day that preceded the consummation of his work tells of a resistance to his divinely appointed destiny, and of a longing to remain upon earth, and when the last day of his life ends with a loud cry of human anguish. More or less vividly is the consciousness everywhere aroused that reconciliation is impossible between this living, human, true image of Christ and the old one, with its unnatural, superhuman features. Hence men are no longer distressed at the loss of this or that greater or smaller part of his history, even though it be a miraculous narrative; freed from dependence upon trivial details, in a truly

Protestant sense freed from all tradition—which is not history, even when it finds a place in the Bible—they are glad, satisfied, piously happy, if only the personality does not altogether dissolve in the mist, and if only its features reveal here the man, and there in some sort the sublime messenger of God. Thus the distance between the opposing parties is continually diminishing; and if Science does not disclaim the sublime Jesus, nor the Church the human, it is possible in some degree to satisfy both, though by no means to satisfy such persons as remain persistently adhering to either of the two extremes.

Even with this approximation, much diversity, and even conflict, of views, must remain as to the ultimate questions—the origin and attributes of the person of Jesus, the mysterious depths of his being and actions, and the harmony of the divine and the human in him. It is so much the more incumbent upon the history of the life of Jesus, if light is to pierce this darkness, to let the facts speak for themselves as clearly, fully, and impartially as possible; to do this even more conscientiously than in any other department of history; and, cautiously and carefully, with the reservation of the right of an independent judgment upon every detail, to restrict the province of supposition and inference and general verdict to the narrowest possible limits. This implies an equal, impartial attention to the facts which support the one or the other standpoint, and an equal, impartial renunciation of those points of view which do violence to history, whether, Strauss-like, they strike miracle out of history beforehand, or, with the opposite school, recognize miracle as belonging to the idea of history; for in controverted questions the decision belongs to history alone, and if history cannot decide, no one can. This is an impartiality which certainly is not granted to all, but only to those who have freed themselves from the narrow rules of the Church on the one hand, and from the formulæ of Science on the other, because their mental characters have been nourished not merely by one or the other, but by both mothers. Nevertheless, a fundamental conviction cannot be dispensed

with—one that is ever present to give light and warmth to the whole from the beginning; and this must be such a conviction as, so far as the subject permits, is built upon a careful logical induction from the facts, and must be held without attempting to force the opinion of any who may not be able to follow. To betray in one sentence our own latest sentiments, no conviction has become more certain to us, in our contemplation of this life, than that there, where the most genuine and unadulterated humanity dwelt, was revealed at the same time not only a religious genius, but the miracle of God and his presence upon earth; the person itself and nothing else is the miracle, the God-confederated man is the living temple of God.[1]

In this sense will the life of Jesus Christ be here delineated. That to which this title—so one-sidedly interpreted by Strauss—always pointed, viz. a genuine human life founded upon God, we look to see standing before us here in flesh and blood.[2]

II.—Ways and Means.

If the title and its explanation are to gain the reader's full assent, the life of Jesus must face several very weighty questions. A life needs material; have we the material? There can be no doubt that a life which owes its exceptionally prominent position in history to its own character and merits, and not to the misunderstanding or the invention of the idle, was originally rich enough in material; the question is, whether that material has come down to us, and in what condition, copious or scanty, pure

[1] That Jesus is something more than a religious genius is best shown by the fact that the unique position in which he stands—distinguished from *all* others as the sinless one—does not belong to the conception of genius, since it is a relative, not an absolute greatness. With this sinlessness stands or falls not only the dogmatic, but also the historical Jesus, a fact which is overlooked with complacent superficiality by so many modern dogmatic and arbitrary manufacturers of history.

[2] Strauss, *Leben Jesu für das Deutsche Volk*, p. 5: "The idea of a life of Jesus is the snare into which the theology of our age necessarily fell, and in which it was necessarily ruined." But this idea of a life of Jesus is altogether the product of an age which has left behind it the old representations of a divine person, and has acquired a strong passion for a human Jesus.

or impure? It is a fact that great historical figures have sunk below our horizon, and we retain scarcely their names; others, though rescued from oblivion, have survived with men and nations in such a manner that we no longer know what they were in themselves, because we only know what they were to the mind and heart and energy of their generations. Is it not possible that a name so fondly cherished by the faith and love of mankind as the name of Jesus, owes the whole of its existing history to love; and that, even after the exclusion of the ideas and sentiments evidently belonging to a later age, the earliest sketches of his life borrowed material and light and colour less from himself than from the varying moods and feelings of the inner circle of his followers?[1] Thus the attempt to construct a life of Jesus is continually exposed to the doubt—no longer, it is true, whether, as Napoleon once asked Herder, he ever lived at all, but—whether he *so* lived; and whoever may succeed, with or without concession, in warding off suspicion as to the purity of his colouring of the picture of Jesus, the objection may still be made by others that the scantiness of the historical remains, and the total absence of any account of Jesus as a youth and as a man, except during the short period of his public ministry, wholly forbid the employment of the high-sounding and ambitious title of a *Life of Jesus*. Happily, after all the welding and casting of the latest criticism, the scientific conviction of all thoughtful men has become less despondent; and it now concerns us to give to this favourable bias a fresh justification by means of a few testing glances at the extent and condition of our sources.

[1] Comp. Schwegler, *Nachapost. Zeitalter*, 1846, I. pp. 258 sqq.

PRE-CHRISTIAN SOURCES.

The glance of the inquirer first turns hopefully towards the circles which should be able to give the earliest and most unbiassed information concerning the work of Jesus, viz. to Judaism and Heathenism. Should it be objected to the Christian sources that their date is uncertain or late, there are Jewish and heathen authors concerning whose date and contemporaneity no doubt exists. Should the Christian sources be accused of having, intentionally or unintentionally, given an ideal colouring to the life of Jesus, the Jewish and heathen sources will exhibit an attitude of sober impartiality, or at any rate they will offer a realistic criticism, from whose comments, disclosures, accusations, and refutations, a number of historical facts is doubtless to be gathered. Even if the two sets of sources directly contradicted each other, if nothing but detractions and calumnies of opponents stood over against the supposed exaggerations of Christianity, a medium might perhaps be deduced from the two extremes, an objectivity from the two subjectivities.

I.—Jewish Sources.

In the closest relation to the life of Jesus stand Israel, and the national life of Israel, the womb whence the life of Jesus sprang. It is at once evident that the history of Jesus must receive a very important contribution from Jewish history before and after his time, even should no Jewish author, no word or deed of the people, have given any intimation of his existence. At the very least, the historical relations of the nation, its physical, political, religious, and social condition, especially in the time of the first Roman Emperors, form the general outlines of the picture in which the person of Jesus is to be drawn as the central figure; but who would not go further, and, instead of

merely externally clothing this personality with the flesh of Jewish history, assume that he lived in the most intimate and vital union with the highest needs and aspirations of the national life, and then, by means of the evidence of actual intercourse, obtain historical satisfaction and historical confirmation of his faith in the facts of this life itself? Thus the life of Jesus does, in fact, derive much material from the rich mine of Jewish history, though the name of Jesus is not even mentioned there; and it is its own fault—that is, the fault of its narrators—if, notwithstanding the laudable example of the first historian of the Church, Eusebius, it neglects to draw that material, as if none could exist without the mention of the name of Jesus.[1] Our attention must therefore, to a certain extent, be directed to the whole of the Old Testament literature, together with its offshoots, which extend far into Christian times, and are collectively known as the Apocrypha. To these must be added the later Jewish literature which, under many forms and names, begins with our era, and in the Talmud—that great panorama of Jewish theology and Jewish theologians—runs towards its close from the third Christian century downwards.

This is the place in which to indicate the connection of the life of Jesus with the whole of the literature of the Jews, though by no means to trace it out in detail. To do the latter is the task of a special science yet in its infancy; and it will be only necessary for us here and there, in the absence of positive conclusions as to the date and origin of individual writings, to give the grounds on which our own opinions are based. Nor do we engage to exhaust our material; to do this with merely the enormous later literature of the Talmud would not only require the devotion of a life-time, but would also encumber this history with a quantity of dead and exceedingly doubtful matter, whilst the best fruit from these immeasurable steppes has already been plucked by diligent hands. Yet we must not neglect to mention

[1] Eusebius, notwithstanding the fables which he has preserved, exhibits an endeavour to illustrate the lives of Jesus and the Apostles out of contemporary history.

one work, as the pearl of the Talmud and as interesting to every one, the compendium of the teaching of the Fathers (Pirke Abot), in which are collected the choicest moral sayings of all the great teachers, from Simeon the Just to Jehudah the Holy. The information supplied by Philo of Alexandria and Josephus of Jerusalem, the contemporaries of Jesus and of the primitive apostolic Church, is of pre-eminent value, and, unlike that derived from later literary remains, at once copious and trustworthy. Of these two writers, one supplements the other, in so far as the former was a venerable old man in the zenith of his religious and scientific renown, under the Emperor Caligula (A.D. 37—41), at the very time when the latter was born of an illustrious priestly and Pharisaic house. Josephus lived to be an influential witness of Jewish history until the end of the century, a defender, and finally an unwilling accomplice with the Romans in the destruction, of Jerusalem (A.D. 70).[1] How much illumination is thrown upon the religious history of Israel in the time of Jesus by the numerous dogmatic, ethical, and in part also historical treatises of Philo—the authenticity of which both as a whole and in details has been for the most part unjustly questioned—will be expressly pointed out in the present work, when we treat of Philo as the representative of a mystic piety. But still more comprehensive are the contributions of Josephus, the greatest and, from the time of the Maccabees downwards, indispensable because unique source of Jewish history. From the works of Josephus the life of Jesus must repeatedly draw material, especially from the two principal works, "The Wars of the Jews," in seven books, first written in Syriac under the Emperor Vespasian, and rendered into Greek about A.D. 75, and "The Jewish Antiquities," in twenty books, from the creation of the world to the beginning of the Jewish war, and published A.D. 94, under the Emperor Domitian; as well as from the two subordinate works, "On the Antiquity of

[1] Josephus was born A.D. 37. *Vita*, i.: τῷ πρώτῳ τῆς τοῦ Γαΐου Καίσαρος ἡγεμονίας.

the Jews, against Apion," in two books, and "The Life," the autobiography of Josephus, his latest work, composed about A.D. 100. Though other writings bearing his name may be spurious, doubtful, or lost; though against the author himself the charge may be brought that he, a man of superficial morality and shrewd self-seeking, to a very great extent lacked the character and the mental and religious profundity of a Philo, and that, consciously or unconsciously, from credulity, defective judgment, or national or personal egotism, he has here and there falsified the history of his nation; yet his general fidelity has never been called in question, confirmed as it is by a comparison of his writings with the Old and New Testaments and other works; and he himself with his own hand has in most cases afforded to the critic the best material for the correction of his errors and misrepresentations.[1]

But is there nothing concerning the person of Jesus in these sources? Nothing in fact, or nothing available, nothing characteristic of the person of Jesus himself, as there is of Judaism. First, as to his contemporaries. As a religious forerunner of Christianity, Philo indeed was early considered to be not only favourable to the new religion, but also one of its first encomiasts. Eusebius, followed by others, is inclined to give full credit to the ecclesiastical tradition, that Philo, in the reign of the Emperor Claudius—who, together with the Roman Senate, on the occasion of the public reading of Philo's treatise against the Emperor Caligula, expressed the highest approval—contracted a friendship with the Apostle Peter, then on a mission to Rome; and, more than this, Eusebius advocates, with growing conviction, the opinion that in his treatise on the contemplative life Philo has described the condition of the early Christian church founded by the Evangelist Mark in Alexandria and Egypt, the

[1] For Philo, see the section which treats of the religious condition of the Jews. For Josephus, see Paret's translation of the *Wars of the Jews*, and of the treatise against Apion, Stuttg., 1855-56, and his article *Josephus*, in Herzog's *R. Encyc.* VII. pp. 24 sqq. Hausrath, *Histor. Zeitschrift*, v. Sybel, XII. pp. 285 sqq.: *On the Jewish historian and statesman, Fl. Josephus.*

whole ecclesiastical life, the Christian communism of the Acts of the Apostles, the fasts and vigils, the use of the apostolic writings, the bishops and deacons.[1] But we must submit to be cruelly undeceived, if we hoped to find such disclosures here. Philo has not described the Christians, but the essentially Jewish Essenes and Therapeutæ, who were certainly so nearly allied to the Christians that even now the supposition of a Christian falsification or interpolation of these writings finds its advocates. In none of his writings has he mentioned either Jesus or the Christians.

The somewhat later Josephus appears to break this death-like silence. First, in the eighteenth book of the Antiquities he has a splendid and unassailable account of John the Baptist, the forerunner of Jesus; then he twice mentions the name of Jesus himself, in one instance giving even a sketch of his history.[2] In order to decide with greater certainty as to the value of these two passages, we must, contrary to what has hitherto been customary, begin with a consideration of the simpler and textually less doubtful one. At the close of the Antiquities, in the twentieth book, before the beginning of the Jewish war (about A.D. 63), the cruelly hasty process of the Sadducean high-priest, Annas the younger, against James, "the brother of Jesus, called the Christ," is related. There can exist scarcely any doubt concerning the authenticity of this passage, which is quoted in full by Origen; here is genuine Jewish history, without a trace of Christian embellishment; and the identity of person with the Christian James is established by the ancient but somewhat legendary notices of the death of the latter by Clement of Alexandria, and chiefly by the Christian Palestinian, Hegesippus. The designation of James as the brother of Jesus, the so-called Christ, is also in itself unprejudicial; the Jewish author expresses, as Origen saw, not indeed his own belief, but the general

[1] Eus. 2, 4, 5, 16, 18.

[2] *Ant.* 18, 5, 2 (John); 18, 3, 3 and 20, 9 1 (Jesus and James).

notoriety of the name of Jesus Christ, as it must have prevailed about the year 70.[1] If it be asked, what is gained by this scanty notice? I reply that the gain is not small. The historical significance of this name is at any rate recognized; the profound silence, more explicable in the case of Philo the Alexandrian than in that of Josephus the Jerusalemite, the later witness of a growing Christian community, and the narrator of the complete history of the Jews, is in some sense broken. One can suppose that he mentioned Jesus, and yet from some motive or other—circumspection or aversion—was not inclined to describe him; or one may probably find that in another, earlier passage, he has nevertheless described him, and precisely on this very account is so brief here. It must also be remarked that by calling James the brother of Jesus, he makes Christianity and Jesus himself participators in the honourable testimony he bears to James when he shows the strong disapprobation of the precipitate and cruel execution of the assumed transgressor of the law, manifested by the most upright and law-respecting men of Jerusalem. If Josephus wrote the passage, he might nevertheless have regarded the Christians' belief in their Messiah as a delusion; but he could have had no doubt of their propriety of conduct, their virtuous living, their conformity to Jewish law, and therefore of the essential excellence of the work of Jesus. This passage is open to only one objection; the other passage in Josephus was most probably forged, or at any rate tampered with by Christians; and moreover, as Origen and Eusebius show, there existed in the third and fourth centuries manuscripts in which was to be found a reading of our present passage that most evidently betrayed a Christian construction of the history of James: "This befell the Jews, in revenge for James the Just, who was a brother of Jesus, the so-called Christ, after the Jews had slain him, the most Just."[2] In the face of this daring Jewish-Christian attempt to ascribe to the historian of the

[1] Origen, *Con. Cels.* 1, 47.

[2] Ibid. l. c.; Eus. *H. E.* 2, 23.

Jewish people the opinion that the ground of the destruction of Jerusalem was the murder of St. James, is it not quite possible that the whole, the other passage included, is the product of Christian emendations of Josephus? The possibility is not to be questioned, but the very simplicity of the existing passage, and the exaggeration of the passage as just quoted, avert suspicion.

The possibility of saving any of the second passage is in inverse proportion to the copiousness, importance, and celebrity of its assertions. "At this time"—so it is related in the eighteenth book of the Antiquities, after an account of the violent attempts of the Procurator Pilate against the nation—"appeared (a certain) Jesus, a wise man, if indeed he may be called a man; for he was a worker of miracles, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with joy, and he drew to himself many Jews, and many also of the Hellenes. This was the Christ. And when, at the instigation of our chief men, Pilate condemned him to the cross, those who had first loved him did not fall away. For he appeared to them alive again on the third day, according as the holy prophets had declared this and a thousand other wonderful things of him. To this day, the sect of Christians, called after him, still exists."[1] Josephus must be held to be a Christian, if in this manner he proclaimed Jesus as the suffering risen Messiah, promised by the prophets. If he wrote of the bringing in of the Hellenes, of the enmity of the chief men, of the friends of the truth, of the unceasing love of the disciples, he must be regarded—and this has hitherto been overlooked—as the most outspoken admirer of the fourth Gospel, both in form and substance, though in fact this Gospel was not written until after the time of Josephus. If he accuses the chief men of Israel (not merely the Sadducees) of procuring the death of Jesus, then must the grossest self-contradiction be ascribed to an author who, himself an aristocrat, never offended the Jewish

[1] A "certain" Jesus, Eus. 1, 11.

aristocracy, and, when mentioning the death of James, represents that aristocracy as maintaining a directly opposite attitude.[1] The external evidence corresponds with the internal. This passage, first adduced and believed by Eusebius, and triumphantly contrasted with the heathen "Acts of Pilate," was absolutely unknown to the older Fathers, such as Origen and the Alexandrians, and indeed to those who were much later.[2] Besides, in the manuscripts, this passage is suspiciously vagrant, and has no fixed place or home. Thus Eusebius shows distinctly that he found the passage before those notices of Pilate in which Josephus, according to his—Eusebius'—opinion (on the ground of the extensive Christian emendations), described the commencement of the judgment consequent upon the murder of Jesus; while at the present day the passage generally stands after those notices.[3] On these grounds, the passage must be rejected; it first appeared, in its present form, in the Catholic Jewish-Gentile Church, and under the patronage of the fourth Gospel, scarcely before the third century, more exactly before Eusebius but after Origen, whose bitter criticism upon Josephus may have given occasion to it.[4]

But for a long time, inquiry concerning the original relations of this passage has been subordinated to the attempt to discover a good, authentic residuum, something genuine in the midst of what is spurious. Men are prepared to strike out more or less, or are content if, after all is struck out, there yet remains a belief in a lost account. Most critics, from Ammon, Eichstädt, and Paulus, to Ewald and Renan, Paret and Weizsäcker, have

[1] Singularly enough, Weizsäcker (*Unters.* p. 5), finds in these "chief men" a proof of authenticity.

[2] Origen, *Con. Cels.* 1, 47. On the other hand, Eus. 1, 11; comp. 1, 9; 9, 5, 7; *Dem. Ev.* 3, 5.

[3] Eus. 2, 6, shows very plainly that he read Jos. *Ant.* 18, 3, § 3 (the section concerning Jesus), before §§ 1 and 2 (concerning Pilate's misdeeds).

[4] I have no doubt of the connection of the origin of the passage with Origen's criticism upon Josephus (who referred the misfortunes of the Jews to the death of James, instead of Jesus). See Origen, l. c.

thus divided the passage. One may think it probable, on general grounds as well as on account of the passage about James, that the historian did not leave Jesus unmentioned. The position of the passage, after the first attempts of Pilate, and before the expulsion of the Jews from Rome (A.D. 19) and the insurrection in Samaria (A.D. 35), can be regarded as appropriate both as to time and subject (as one among many national calamities). From the passage can be gathered something neutral, and therefore possible—that which is said of the wise man, of Pilate's, and perhaps of the Sadducees' share in the crucifixion, of the permanence of the Christian community. On the whole, however, the preponderating evidence is on the side of the spuriousness of the whole passage. There are both external and internal evidences against its authenticity; while the text is so thoroughly christianized that its defenders and restorers palpably contradict themselves. Jesus, according to Josephus, is at once a preacher of virtue and a deceiver and misleader of the people, his execution the clearest justice and the purest injustice![1] How much of the text remains in the midst of such contradictions? The final decision seems to us to be given by the question, Is it more improbable that the Christians should have inserted the Jesus-paragraph, than that Josephus should have been silent as to the work of Jesus? It is easy to explain the latter, but still easier the former. It is by no means necessary to explain the silence concerning Jesus, the slight allusion on the occasion of his brother's death excepted, as an altogether inconceivable denial of his importance, or even as indicating an actually less prominent position of Jesus, which latter would indeed be fatal to our Christian accounts; it is sufficiently explained by supposing the historian to be embarrassed in judgment, too cultivated and conscientious

[1] According to Ewald, Paret, and Schaff, Josephus considered Jesus to be a sorcerer and seducer; according to Renan and Weizsäcker, he virtually recognized him, at most demurring to his Messiahship. According to Ewald, he disapproved of the execution; according to Paret, he approved of it.

to condemn Jesus, but at the same time too prejudiced and too Jewish in sentiment to bestow upon him the praise which he was in a position to give to the Baptist, but not to Jesus the Messiah, the divider of the nation. On the other hand, it is more than intelligible how, in the silence of Josephus, whether that silence was complete or was broken by the slight suggestive hint given in connection with the death of James, the complementary Christian historical interpolation came into existence: the Jewish historian, zealously studied by the Christians, as Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome show, could not be silent concerning the crown of Jewish history, the bringer both of salvation and of the judgment which fell upon Jerusalem immediately after the double murder. Thus did these interpolations of faith, not of fraud, find their way into the text, as in so many other cases during the first centuries.[1]

The still fruitless search among the Jews for traces of Jesus must therefore be prosecuted downwards past Josephus. The farther downwards we come—a century, centuries after the time of Jesus—the less certainty there is. Statements made by the Christian Justin Martyr, as well as by the heathen author Celsus in the second century, show that malicious Jewish traditions, oral and written, were freely circulated concerning the Galilean deceiver.[2] Their report is in exact agreement with the accounts furnished by the late Talmud, in particular by its latest blossom, the Gemara—the commentary (begun in the third century and concluded in the fifth) upon the Mischna, which had been collected by Rabbi Judas the Holy about A.D. 170—and chiefly

[1] But comp. Jerome, *Viri ill.* 13. Credner (*Einl.* p. 581), following Leclerc and Lardner, has also attacked the genuineness of 20, 9, 1. Against the testimony of Josephus, also C. Gerlach, *Die Weiss. A. T. b. Joseph, und das angebl. Zeugniss v. Christo*, 1863. In its favour, H. Gerlach, *Rom. Statth.* 1865; Langen, 1866, p. 442; Schaff, *K. G.* 1867, p. 61.

[2] Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 10, 17, 108: The Jews, indeed their high-priests and teachers (cap. 117), have sent their special agents out into the world: ὅτι αἵρεσίς τις ἄθεος καὶ ἄνομος ἐγήγερται ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ τινος Γαλιλαίου πλάνου. His immorality. The lie told of his resurrection and ascension. Origen, *Con. Cels.* 1, 28.

in the tractates Sanhedrin and Shabbat.[1] Jesus, or Jeschu (no Jeschua, no Saviour, but the name expresses God-forsakenness), is often mentioned, and still oftener is he alluded to without mention of his name, as "the fellow," "the fool," "he who may not be, ought not to be, named;" yet what is told of him is for the most part pure malice or nonsense, and abounds in contradictions.[2] The lies about his birth—that he was the son of Mary Magdalene, the daughter of Eli (comp. Luke iii. 23), and dresser of women's hair; and also that he was the son of Pandera-Pappus—are well enough known, and must, alas! be discussed in a subsequent part of this work. The teacher of Jesus is said to have been the Rabbi Joshua, the son of Perachiah, in whose company Jesus, during the persecution of the scribes under King Jannæus, fled to Egypt and returned thence.[3] He, was, however, an intractable, scoffing disciple, whom the teacher himself excommunicated.[4] From that time he practised sorcery, which he had learned in Egypt—indeed, as later witnesses assert, from his teacher himself, and seduced many of the people into idolatry, not by declaring himself to be God, but by rejecting the Law, scoffing at sacrifices and at the high-priests, and erecting an image before which he and others prostrated themselves.[5] He

[1] Meelführer, *Jesus im Talmud*, 1669. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, 1711, 2 vols. Werner, *Jesus im T.* 1731. Christian Schöttgen, *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, 1742, Vol. II. pp. 693 sqq. Comp. Ammon, *L. J.* I. pp. 126 sqq. Rabbi Judas under the Antonines; comp. Leusden, p. 6; recently also Grätz. Others place him about A.D. 200—220.

[2] Eisenm. I. p. 64; comp. *Hist. Jesch.* p. 35: יזוֹשׁ name of derision: Deleatur (י) memoria ejus (ז) et aboleatur (ו) nomen ejus (שׁ). The ornatrix capillorum muliebrium, comtrix mulierum (Schöttgen, pp. 694 sq.), p. 16. Daughter of Eli, Schöttgen, p. 702.

[3] Comp. *Ant.* 13, 13, 5; 14, 2; 15, 5. Grätz, p. 113: B.C. 94—89.

[4] For the intractability of the disciple, see *Sanhedr.* fol. 107, 2. Schöttgen, p. 697. Also *Hist. Jesch.* pp. 14, 19.

[5] *Shabbat*, fol. 104, 2: Annon filius Stadae magiam ex Ægypto adduxit per incisionem in carne sua factam? Schöttgen (p. 699) understands this to imply only a smuggling of the jealously guarded art out of Egypt; but, according to the context, it is plain that the infliction of wounds in the flesh on the Sabbath, as a means of

was surrounded by a band of disciples. He had five disciples, Matthai (Matthew), Nakai, Nezer, Boni, Todah (Thaddeus). Men who worked miracles in the name of Jesus are frequently mentioned, such as one James the son of Sechaniah, who scoffed at the Law as "your Law," before Rabbi Eliezer in Sepphoris (Galilee); it was taught by the Rabbis that it was better to die than to be healed by these men. Finally, Jesus (with craft permissible towards a deceiver) was entrapped by witnesses, brought to trial, condemned to be stoned, and since, in spite of a proclamation by the herald, no one for forty days testified to his innocence, he was stoned on the eve of the Passover, and then hanged in order that he might go to hell.[1] Neither did the five disciples escape a merited death, notwithstanding their appeals to Scripture. Of such elements, with accretions of later vile fancies, the infamous, multiform, mediæval lampoon against Jesus was composed.[2]

With strong repugnance, we specify sources which in reality are no sources. The "Fire-arms of Satan," as Wagenseil called them in 1681, are equally repulsive from their malice and their stupidity. This hot-blooded, splenetic Judaism of the letter has only revealed its own character, for after the lapse of centuries it was still irritated and unjust. Moreover, the grossest ignorance is everywhere exhibited. The Magdalene is confounded with Mary the mother of Jesus, and her name derived from the art of hair-dressing, instead of from the village of Magdala. The name Stada is sometimes applied to Mary's husband, sometimes to the deceiver, sometimes to Mary herself. Jesus is made to live

sorcery, is alluded to. The abrogation of the law and the Sabbath, and the introduction of a new law, are also mentioned in the *Hist. Jeschuæ*, ed. Huldr. pp. 35, 43, 59, sq. 126.

[1] Schöttgen, pp. 699 sq., נַעֲרָב פֶּסַח (14th of Nisan), *Shabb.* f. 67; *Sanh.* f. 43; *Hist. Jesch.* pp. 87 sq. Other names of disciples in *Hist. Jesch.* p. 35. Comp. below, Apostles.

[2] *Sepher toledot Jeschua Hannozeri, hist. Jeschuæ Nazareni*, ed. J. J. Huldricus, Leyden, 1705. Earlier rec. 1505. Comp. Wagenseil, *Tela ignea Satanæ*, Altorf. 1681. Hase, *L. J.*, 5th ed. p. 17.

during the reign of King Jannæus, the Asmonæan, who died seventy-nine years before the Christian era; and this is done in order, by his death, to make room for a renewed ascendancy of Pharisaism, represented among others by the names of Joshua ben Perachiah and Simon ben Shetah. According to this account, Jesus must have fled to Egypt previous to the year B.C. 79, and returned to Jerusalem about that year. In one passage the death of Jesus is transferred from Jerusalem to Lydda. The utter absence of rational congruity between the different items of information betrays itself finally in this, that out of the mingled perplexity and fairness of the Talmudists different Jesuses can be distinguished—one who adhered to the Law and despised only the oral tradition, another who made himself God. If here and there we also find apparently historical notices concerning the mother of Jesus and her birth, the royal descent of Jesus, which is once mentioned, his sojourn in Egypt, his miracles, his opposition to the Law and to tradition, his accusation, the witnesses, his death at the feast of the Passover,—these are most probably merely borrowed from the Christian Gospels down to John's, and arbitrarily further elaborated.[1] Many things also have reference to later Christian times, as when the magic and image-worship of the Egyptian Gnostics is ascribed to Jesus as an Egyptian.[2]

II.—Heathen Sources.

The information derived from heathen Greek and Roman sources is more copious and reliable than that from Jewish sources. Here, as there, exists a strong aversion to Christianity, but in the heathen sources we find more disdain than violent

[1] Royal descent, *Sanh.* f. 43, 1: Jesus sanguini regio cognatione conjunctus erat. Schöttgen (pp. 700, 703) finds in this a spiteful juxtaposition of Jesus with the family of Herod, which, however, is not indicated. The employment of Christian sources, the Gospels included, by the Jews, see, *e.g.* Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 10.

[2] Comp. Irenæus, *Con. Hær.* 1, 24, 5: Utuntur autem et hi (Basilid.) *magia* et *imaginibus* et incantationibus et invocationibus et reliqua universa periergia.

animosity, therefore more silence than calumny; and the incidental notices, to which the collisions between Christianity and the Roman State give occasion, are here less sensational, more objective, and characterized by a more cultured tone. There is a great difference between different periods. From the second to the third and fourth centuries, the attitude of the heathen world towards the religion which conquered Rome grew both more antagonistic and more friendly. One could wish that the first century had felt a like interest. A nearer witness of the life of Jesus, that first century had at its disposal, if not, as Justin Martyr thought, the records of Pilate, yet an incalculable quantity of historical material, which its indifference did not simply undervalue, but altogether forfeited; whilst the succeeding centuries, with all their zeal and with all their love, were left to gather together only what, at so great a distance, they could learn mediately from the Christians themselves, from our own and other Gospels, from the existing—understood or misunderstood—Christianity, or from the slanders of the Jews. On this account it is useless to specify in detail the notices and opinions of the heathen world after the middle and end of the second century, especially after the appearance of the decisive work of the philosopher Celsus. However interesting the neo-Platonic studies concerning Jesus in the third and fourth centuries may be, as well as the heathen books for school-boys, concerning "Jesus and Pilate," which belong to the time of the persecution in the fourth century, they have their proper place elsewhere, in the history of the diffusion of Christianity, in the history of Rome and of Christianity.[1]

The contributions of heathen literature to the history of the Judaism of those times are necessarily of value for the life of

[1] Comp., for the attitude of Rome towards Christianity, my *Uebertritt Kaiser Constantins d. Gr. zum Christenthum*, 1862, and my article, *Lucian von Samosata*, in Herzog's *R. Encyc.* Among the neo-Platonists, Porphyry and Hierocles may be specially mentioned. The *Acta Pilati*, in Justin, *Ap.* 1, 35 (where are also the tables of Quirinius, cap. 34); used in the schools, in the interests of heathenism, Eus. *H. E.* 1, 9, 11; 9, 5, 7.

Jesus, whether we fix our attention upon the historians, and especially Tacitus, who devotes several pages at the beginning of the fifth book of his history to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the circumstances which preceded it; or upon the poets and satirists who scoffed at the assiduity with which the Jews propagated their religion. If the life of Jesus had to describe the general preparedness of the world, including the heathen world, for a higher religion—a task which has often been attempted, and which appears to be, in a unique sense, appropriate to the historical significance of this life—then would the whole circle of classical literature acquire the position of an original source of the first rank in proximity and fulness. Since, however, in point of fact, Jesus, within the sharply defined and circumscribed limits of his historical activity, came scarcely, if at all, into contact with heathenism, sought it out neither as learner nor as teacher, the great full-length picture of heathenism as playing a part in the history of Christianity is justly and fittingly transferred to the point where Christianity seeks it out, and where it flows into Christianity, i. e. in the age of the Apostles.[1]

We owe the earliest notices of the life of Jesus and the Church which he founded to the writers of the time of Trajan, at the end of the first century. Though scanty, they are peculiarly valuable on account of their antiquity and their independence of Christian and other sources. The great Tacitus, in his Histories, has occasion to mention the Jews in connection with the burning of Jerusalem (A.D. 70); and in the fifteenth book of his Annals, in describing the burning of Rome under the Emperor Nero (A.D. 64), he mentions the Christians, to whom the diabolical malice of the imperial incendiary imputed his crime. Tacitus puts the Talmudists to shame, at least by the exactness and accuracy with which he gives the date of the life of Jesus. "The author of this name, Christus (thus he confounds, as, in fact, do all his successors, the personal with the

[1] Therefore this is opposed to the views of Strauss on the course of the development of Greco-Roman civilization, *Leb. Jesu fur das d. Volk*, pp. 179 sqq.

official title), was executed in the reign of Tiberius by the Procurator Pontius Pilate."[1] More than this memorandum of his death, and an intimation of the temporary extinction of the agitation which, at first purely Palestinian, afterwards extended westwards as far as Rome, by the death of the leader of the party, he does not give, for he is no friend to Christianity: death and execution is the only just and legitimate answer of the Roman State to both the leader and his followers, whose detestable superstition and clearly established hatred of the human race have merited the severest punishment, though not at the hands of Nero. When he expressly calls Judæa the "source of this evil," it becomes yet clearer why he so summarily disposes of Christ, as a mere degenerate variety of Judaism, as the refuse of what was vilest in Judaism, as an example of that religion of hatred without the virtues which was buried out of sight of history, if not under the cross of Pilate and the crosses of Nero, yet doubtless under the ruins of Jerusalem.[2] Suetonius, the contemporary of Tacitus, has, in the same connection, mentioned the Christians in one short sentence in his Life of Nero, where he speaks of the punishment of the Christians, a kind of men addicted to a new and vicious superstition, as one of the excellent measures due to this Emperor's severity. But the same writer, in his Life of Claudius, who expelled the Jews from Rome, is, unlike Tacitus, guilty of the undeniable historical oversight of treating "Christus" as a restless and seditious

[1] *Ann.* 15, 44: Auctor nominis ejus Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat; repressaque in præsens exitiabilis superstitio rursus erumpebat, non modo per Judæam, originem ejus mali, sed per urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque.

[2] *Ibid.:* Odio humani generis convicti sunt. Comp. also *Hist.* 5, 5, concerning the Jews: Adversus omnes alios hostile odium. Although it is on this account possible that Tacitus saw in the fall of Jerusalem the merited destruction of both Judaism and Christianity, yet the assumption of Jacob Bernays, in his work on the Chronicle of Sulpic. Severus (1861), that Tacitus ascribed to the destroyer of Jerusalem the intention of uprooting both religions, is untenable. See my article *Vespasian*, Herzog, xvii. p. 165.

Jewish agitator still living in the reign of Claudius, and even in Rome itself.[1]

At the same period, the Emperor Trajan endeavoured to acquire a somewhat better acquaintance with Christianity, mediately, by means of the law-suits against the Christians. About the year A.D. 104, the younger Pliny, the contemporary of the two historians, sent, as Proconsul in Bithynia, information to Rome concerning the Christians, in a well-known letter to the Emperor—a letter which issued in important results. Pliny enlightened himself concerning the Christians by a three-fold method of inquiry. First, he learnt from the heathen that true Christians sacrificed neither to the gods nor to the Emperors, and refused to curse "Christus." Next, from the Christians themselves, he heard of their early morning and evening meetings, of the songs of praise to Christ as God, and their holy moral vows at the former, and of the meals of which they partook in common at the latter. Finally, he applied torture in order to discover their principles. Although he was thus in a position to hear and to narrate a complete gospel of pious conviction, he contented himself in his heathen self-complacency with reporting to the Emperor that he had discovered nothing but perverse and extravagant superstition. The inquiry, however, constrained him to take one step forward in his estimation of Christianity—a step which was of considerable importance to heathenism as well as to Christianity, but which, indeed, required still another full

[1] Suet. *Nero*, 16: Multa sub eo et animadversa severe et coërcita nec minus instituta: adhibitus sumtibus modus:—afflicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novæ ac maleficæ. Ibid. *Claud.* 16: Impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes. This is not the place to criticise other explanations. If the writer had been thinking of an ordinary Jewish agitator, we should certainly have had a *Chrestus quidam*. When Wieseler, however, in the article *Römerbrief*, in the Supplement to Herzog, opposes (contrary to Renan and others) the only tenable view, and does it especially on the ground that the highly cultivated Suetonius would otherwise have betrayed a too great ignorance, he does not see that ignorance concerning Christianity was disgraceful to no Roman. Also Mangold, *Der Römerbrief*, &c. 1866, pp. 39 sq., sees in the *Chrestus* of Suetonius the confounding of a Jewish disturber with Jesus.

century before it could gain the recognition of the old world: he did not discover in Christianity the criminal religion of Tacitus and Suetonius, and it seemed possible to him to tolerate the name of Christian as a harmless one, confining punishment to offences of a civil character. Thus one will scarcely venture, on the strength of what is said by Tacitus or Suetonius, to cast suspicion upon the origin of Christianity or upon the Christian Gospels, the tone of which differs so widely from that of the two historians.[1]

After the middle of the second century, the heathen accounts of Christianity become fuller. Lucian, the Epicurean scoffer, has depicted the founder of Christianity, chiefly in his "Death of Peregrinus," but only from hearsay, and without making any use of Jewish or Christian sources, so far as he knew of such. The founder of the new, wide-spread, secret doctrine was to him a well-known character, but one who had long since vanished from the stage. Yet he does not mention him by name, he speaks of him only as the crucified sophist, or, ironically, as the great man. Of his life he had no exact knowledge. The famous Syrian exorcist in the "Friend of Lies" can scarcely have anything to do with Jesus, since he appears as still living. Lucian knew nothing more of the sophist than that he was crucified for introducing his new mysteries: for, as the most distinguished lawgiver of the Christians, the sophist had enjoined them to repudiate the Greek gods and to worship him, and had led them to believe that, by this act of apostasy, they would become brethren. Lucian also less distinctly intimates that the Christian communism, as well as the foolish belief in immortality, rested upon this man's doctrines and precepts. What else he says of the organization and customs of the Christians of his time does not come within our province; and his notice of Jesus is indeed of no further value, since he describes him essentially from the

[1] Pliny, *Ep.* 10, 97, 98: Nihil aliud inveni, quam superstitionem pravam et immodicam. Comp. my article in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 387: *Doubts as to the genuineness of the Edict of Hadrian concerning the Christians.*

point of view of that age, and represents him in one place as a Greek sophist, and in another as a denier of the Greek gods.

About this time begins the increasingly exclusive use of the written sources of Judaism, and yet more of Christianity. The Neo-pythagorean Numenius is said to have narrated and ingeniously interpreted a fragment of the life of Jesus, but without mentioning the name, in the third book of his work on the Highest Good. It is improbable that Phlegon, the freedman of Hadrian, in his narrative of an earthquake and darkness in the reign of the Emperor Tiberius, alluded, as Origen supposes, to the occurrences which took place at the death of Jesus; but, on the other hand, in the thirteenth or fourteenth of his historical books, confounding Jesus with Peter, he spoke of the founder of the Christian faith, and said that many of his predictions (perhaps concerning the destruction of Jerusalem) had received their fulfilment. Galenus the Eclectic, in the second half of the second century, appealed to Jesus' custom of speaking in parables as an evidence that the majority of men are not swayed by logical reasons.[1] No one has ever, then or since, more industriously investigated Christianity, either in its literature or in the lives of its representatives, than that most terrible of all its adversaries, the refuter and proselytizer in the persecution under Marcus Aurelius, about the year 177, namely, Celsus the Platonist, the author of "The True Word."[2] "I know everything," says Celsus. "We have everything out of your own books; we need no further

[1] Numenius, ap. Origen, *Con. Cels.* 4, 51. Phlegon, ap. eund. 2, 14, 33, 59. The earthquake is said to have occurred in Bithynia, and the darkness to have been such that the stars were visible. For Galenus, see *De sent. polit. platon, ap. Abulfed. hist. anteislam.* ed. Fleischer, 1831, p. 109. Schmidt, *Essai*, p. 344. His philosophy, in Zeller, *Phil. d. Griech.* iii. 1, pp. 446 sqq. (1852).

[2] This is not the place to enlarge upon the date and teaching of Celsus (comp. Origen, *Con. Cels. præf.* 4, 1, 8), the author of the λόγος ἀληθὴς (1, 17; 8, 76). The study of this work continually strengthens me in the firm conviction that Celsus was a Platonist, and wrote when the persecution under Marcus Aurelius was at its height (that is, A.D. 176—180); comp. Origen, *Con. Cels.* 7, 40; 8, 39, 41, 69. Volkmar, without fresh evidence, places him not earlier than about A.D. 200 (*Urspr. Ev.* p. 165).

evidence; you slay yourselves with your own sword."[1] Besides the writings of "the Great Church"—Matthew, Luke, John (Redepenning quite unjustly doubted his employment of the last)—he studied the Gnostics and the Jews, and represented a Jew as opening the attack.[2] He followed the narrative of our Gospels from the birth by a virgin to the passion, the vinegar and gall, the miracles connected with the death and the resurrection; and from other sources, which still exist in part, he derived his belief in the repulsiveness of Jesus and the sinfulness of his disciples.[3] From the Jews he learnt that Jesus was not born in wedlock.[4] In his opinion, the Gospels are based essentially upon fraud. A part of the fraud belongs to the founder: he proclaimed himself to be God and the son of a virgin; he, with John, his companion at the execution, invented the voice from heaven at the Jordan; and in his miracles he made use of fraudulent jugglery, which failed him in the critical hour.[5] His disciples added to these inventions others. Sometimes they lied clumsily, as in the genealogies of Jesus, where they even bring him into connection with the progenitor of all men and with the ancient kings of the Jews; sometimes ludicrously, as when they make it appear that he foretold the manner of his own death; and even in that very age his followers still showed how capable they were of lying grossly, by the fact that, like drunken men who lay violent hands on themselves, they altered and falsified the text of the Gospel three, four, many times in order the better to defend themselves against objections.[6] In addition to the lies, there were forced inferences and interpretations of prophecy,—the prophets were made to predict all that Jesus did, although in general their predictions fitted others better than him.[7] In any case, the history of the resurrection must be held doubtful: for

[1] *πάντα γὰρ οἶδα*, 1, 12; 2, 74.

[2] 1, 28; 5, 54 sq.; 5, 59: *οἱ ἀπὸ μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας*. Sects, cap. 62.

[3] 6, 75; 2, 46. Repulsiveness already mentioned by Justin, *Tryph.* 88.

[4] 1, 28.

[5] 1, 28, 40 sq., 48 sqq., 58, 67 sq., 71.

[6] 2, 13, 15; 2, 26 (comp. 19), 27, 32.

[7] 2, 28 sqq.

who witnessed it all? According to the Christians themselves, a crazy woman, and another of this band of jugglers who either made his dreams accord with his wishes, or, like numberless others, constructed, with the help of a diseased imagination, an appearance that answered to his desire, or, what is the most credible of all, intended to astonish others by his lies, and to prepare the way in the world for deceit. For the rest, this Jesus was refuted by his own life, most of all by his dying.[1]

What, then, was the life of "the man of Nazareth"? In point of fact—according to the Jew—Jesus was the fruit of adultery, and was secretly born during the period of his mother's betrothal, in a vile little Jewish town, of a poor and not even beautiful peasant, a spinster and seamstress, after the carpenter to whom she was betrothed, hearing of her intercourse with the soldier Panthera, had, in spite of all the eloquence of her defence, cast her forth to shame and wretchedness. In want and poverty, Jesus was compelled to become an hireling in Egypt. But he learned there various secret arts, and in reliance on these he returned home, where he proclaimed himself to be God, and in vanity and pride, untruthfulness and impiety, he turned the people from their faith, though he was liberal enough to admit others to the sonship of God.[2] With ten or eleven wicked fellows, publicans and seamen, men of the most dissolute character, he lived upon scanty mendicant fare, and wandered about the country in ignominious flight, especially after he had been pronounced deserving of punishment.[3] Finally, he was apprehended, nay, was betrayed by his own disciples, being less cared for by his own followers, not merely than a general, but than the captain of a robber band.[4] He wept and whined, was bound, was mocked with a purple robe, a crown of thorns, a sceptre, and invective; the blood of God flowed, but he did not come down from the cross; he who had condemned him enjoyed

[1] 2, 54 sqq.
[2] 1, 28, 37, 39, 48; 2, 7.
[3] 1, 66; 2, 46.
[4] 2, 8—10.

immunity from retribution, and the risen Jesus appeared to none but the Magdalene.[1]

The life of Jesus from the pen of Celsus demands no refutation, terrible as are the weapons of critical acumen which heathen passion wields against the person of Jesus, and against Christianity as a whole. It is necessary merely to take note that here we gain no new life of Jesus. Celsus has refuted himself, "slain himself" with his own weapon, by conceding to Jesus the finest utterances in the Sermon on the Mount, and at the same time—particularly from the fifth book onwards—bringing forward evidence to prove that the heathen philosophy had said it all before, only better and more accurately, and that Christianity betrayed itself as misunderstood and maimed philosophy. Therefore Christianity was philosophy, at any rate, and not merely fraud. Nay, it was *the* philosophy with which, in the midst of the terrible persecution, he was willing to make peace, and from which he demanded only a few concessions to heathenism. And here is a marvel: Celsus perceived that Christianity could not, would not give way; but could not Celsus give way? When he himself said that the highest God whom the Christians worshipped, ought never to be forsaken; when he, with the philosophers, deprecated an exaggerated reverence of the sensuous demons, i.e. the gods; which stood nearer to a change of position, the weak reed of worldly wisdom, or strong Christianity?

[1] 2, 33—37, 68—73.

CHRISTIAN SOURCES.

We turn next to the sources belonging to a more confined area: the curiosity which has been diligently seeking and collecting what it could find among the Jews and the heathen, is thrown back upon Christian ground unsatisfied and almost unrewarded. It is true that here also there is still a wide field. We can once more make the attempt to gather up, wherever it is possible, the narratives, vestiges, and hints which lie outside of those New Testament archives that have been sanctified by the faith and use of the Church, and to listen to the old oral traditions of natural growth, the old rejected Gospels, and the old ejected parties of the Church; yet one speedily turns from the spurious antiquities to what is genuinely ancient, from the abandoned outworks to the strong citadel of faith and knowledge which stands secure in our Gospels.

I.—Christian Sources outside the New Testament.

We can here distinguish between the mass of scattered references, to the life and teaching of Jesus made by the Christian authors of the first centuries, and the larger documents on the life of Jesus which have been wholly or in part preserved, and are collectively known as the Apocryphal Gospels. So far as such references exhibit points of contact with, or are based upon these Gospels, they need not be specially noticed; it is, however, quite possible that isolated and apparently independent notices are, though frequently without our knowledge, derived from such Gospels.

It must here be at once admitted that these traditions of the Fathers add but little to our knowledge of the life of Jesus as a whole. They merely bring to the Gospels this or that narrative, this or that sentence, by which in the most favourable cases this

life receives a certain fresh illumination, while its general form is neither traced out nor altered. When to the above is added the fact that many apparently new contributions rest, sometimes merely upon a freer treatment, sometimes on an amplification, and, finally, sometimes—as, in particular, the more exact chronology of the birth, the first public appearance, and the death of Jesus—solely upon a more or less successful calculation based upon the narratives of our Gospels, without additional sources, it will be seen that what is really new is a very scanty remainder. In the last century these remains were collected—the remains of the utterances of Jesus rather than of his acts; but the collections then made will no longer in any wise satisfy the requirements of the present day.[1]

Not to withhold from any inquirer a short inventory of the possessions of which this history will make use, we may state that there exist various accounts of the lineage of Jesus. Justin Martyr, as well as Irenæus, gives the Davidic descent of Mary; the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the extraction of Jesus from the tribes of Judah and Levi; Julius Africanus, the genealogies and dwelling-places of the family in general; and Hegesippus, the names of the nearest kindred. Justin depicts the Baptist at the Jordan, and the form of Jesus; the Epistle of Barnabas gives a fresh description of the choosing of the disciples, and says that Jesus selected the vilest sinners as Apostles (according to Matt. ix. 13); Clement of Alexandria gives the names of the seventy disciples, and Clement of Rome, in his Homilies, those of the woman of Canaan and her sick daughter, Justa and Berenice (Veronica). Eusebius mentions the monument erected in Paneas by the gratitude of the woman who had

[1] Comp. Grabii *Spicilegium patrum*, 1700, I. pp. 12 sqq.: Dicta aliqua Jesu Chr. Fabricius, *Cod. apocr. N. T.*, 1703, I. pp. 322 sqq.: De dictis Christi, &c. Koerner, *De sermon. Jesu ἀγράφοις*, 1766. Translation of these sayings of Jesus in R. Hofmann, *L. J. nach den Apokryphen*, 1851, pp. 317 sqq. These collections are not altogether satisfactory, since later criticism has destroyed several sayings (the Barnabas passage, for instance); and, moreover, careful sifting, order, and arrangement are wanting.

an issue of blood. Clement of Rome says that the excitement produced by the public appearance of Jesus reached as far as Rome, where astonished crowds gathered together; Clement of Alexandria speaks of his last gifts and injunctions to the disciples, the gift of knowledge (*Gnosis*) to those he loved best, and the command to go to the heathen after they had remained twelve years in Jerusalem; and the aged Papias gives the death of Judas Iscariot. Over and above all this, Justin and later writers present us with many details concerning the views and opinions of the Jews and heathen.

Of the sayings of Jesus, we pass over those which modern criticism does not recognize, such as the often-mentioned one in the Epistle of Barnabas, as well as the slight textual variations which are in many instances to be found between the quotations of the oldest authors and the corresponding passages in our Gospels, and even between the different manuscripts of the Gospels themselves.[1] A number of variations are important, and will have to be considered, as, for example, in the sayings of Jesus concerning the knowledge of the Father and the Son, the new birth, and oaths. Others are merely free renderings or paraphrases of the text we possess; and, resting mostly upon sources which are by no means more original than our Gospels, they are comparatively valueless against our text, as will be shown in detail in the proper place.[2] It is of interest here to

[1] Thus the constantly cited passage in Barn. 4: Resistamus omni iniquitati et odio habeamus eam, is explained by a reference to the Sinaitic MS., which reads, not Sicut dicit filius Dei, but Sicut decet filios Dei (Gr. ὡς πρέπει υἱοῖς θ.). Comp. Volkmar, *Urspr. u. Ev.*, 1866, p. 117. For an example of textual variation in the MSS. of our New Testament itself, see Luke x. 42.

[2] Thus the saying in Clement and Origen, *De Orat.* § 2, αἰτεῖτε τὰ μεγάλα καὶ τὰ μικρὰ ὑμῖν προστεθήσεται· καὶ αἰτεῖτε τὰ ἐπουράνια, καὶ τὰ ἐπίγεια ὑμῖν προστεθήσεται, is evidently only fashioned out of Matt. vi. 33. The saying in 2 Clem. 8, Irenæus 2, 34, 3, out of Luke xvi. 10 sq. So, again, the saying of Jesus, Matt. x. 16, 28, is, in 2 Clem. 5 and elsewhere, elaborately expanded into a dialogue between Jesus and Peter: Petrus ait, si autem lupi agnos discerpserint, &c. Figures derived from sayings and incidents taken from sources or due to literary licence are, *e. g.*, also Clem. *Hom.* 3, 50, 52; 8, 6; 12, 29; 18, 15; Justin, *Ap.* 1, 32, 50; *Tryph.* 53, 58, 101, 103, 106.

observe, that though it is true the early Church used, besides our Gospels—which in their present four-fold form did not obtain exclusive currency until the end of the second century—other Gospels, which, however, were neither older nor better than ours (as Justin shows); yet ours won their pre-eminent position step by step during the second century, and the leading men of the second century, who were in possession of other sources, were by no means (as Credner inferred from Justin Martyr) indifferent to our Gospels or despisers of this fare.[1]

There yet remain to be noticed a few contributions, chiefly sayings, which do not exactly resemble anything to be found in our Gospels. Many of these, however, are distinguished by no strongly marked peculiarity from what we possess in our Gospels, and may have been actually uttered by Jesus, or afterwards elaborated in the Church out of older material. Thus there are such sentences as the following:—"On account of the weak I became weak, on account of the hungry I was an-hungered, and on account of the thirsty I was athirst," which may recall Matt. xxv. 35. "Seek to increase from what is little, and to become little from what is great" (comp. Matt. xx. 26, Luke xvi. 10). "Those who will see me and will obtain possession of my kingdom must lay hold of me through anguish and suffering" (comp. Matt. xvi. 24, Acts xiv. 22).[2] Very frequently, especially in the Clementine Homilies, appears the precept, "Be ye good money-changers," recalling Matt. xxv. 27, and perhaps an after-growth from it. So also the saying, "Wherein I seize you, therein I judge you" (comp. Matt. xxiv. 40, xxv. 1). "If you are gathered in my bosom, and keep not my commandments, I

[1] Comp. the researches of Semisch (*Apost. Denkwürd. des Märt. Justin*, 1848), Bindemann, Frank, Credner, Zeller, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar.

[2] Comp. Origen upon Matt. xvii. 21: *καὶ Ἰ. γοῦν φησι· διὰ τοὺς ασθενοῦντος ἠσθένουν καὶ διὰ τοὺς πεινῶντας ἐπείνων, καὶ διὰ τοὺς διψῶντας ἐδίψων.* Matt. xx. 28, in Cod. Bez.: *ὑμεῖς δὲ ζητεῖτε ἐκ μικροῦ αὐξῆσαι καὶ ἐκ μείζονος ἔλαττον εἶναι.* Similarly, Leo M., *Ep.* 55, *ad Pulch*: Qui de pusillo volebant crescere et de infimis ad summa transire. The third saying in Barn. 7: *οἱ θέλοντές με ἰδεῖν καὶ ἅψασθαί μου τῆς βασιλείας ὀφείλουσι θλιβέντες καὶ παθόντες λαβεῖν με.*

will put you away, saying, Depart from me, I know you not, ye workers of iniquity" (comp. Matt. vii. 22, &c., xxiii. 37).[1] Thus these and several other passages can be easily adapted to our Gospels.

The saying which Irenæus ascribes to Jesus, "I have often desired to hear one of these sayings, but have had no one to say it," would be more enigmatical were it intended to express an unsatisfied longing of his after knowledge. But even the Gnostics held the opposite opinion with reference to Jesus (comp. Matt. xiii. 17).[2] Some other sayings would directly contradict our knowledge of the character of the teaching of Jesus derived from other sources. According to Luke vi. 5, in the so-called Beza manuscript (of the sixth century), Jesus meets with a man who is working on the Sabbath, and says to him, "Man, if thou knowest what thou art doing, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed, and art a transgressor of the Law." Beza himself questioned this passage, though on insufficient grounds; the teaching of Jesus will show that his real middle course in the matter of the observance of the Sabbath was this, that he would make the Sabbath free, would even make it as a working-day, not to the man who knew, but to the man who acted piously. In still stronger contrast to his teaching as elsewhere credibly handed down, and to the very character of Jesus, would be the sayings of the Lord which Irenæus, in general so reliable an authority, collected out of the mouths of aged disciples of John, the disciple of the Lord, and the genuineness of which seemed to him to be confirmed by a glance at the writings of Papias, the assumed disciple of John, in the middle of the

[1] Clem. *Hom.* 2, 51; 3, 50; 18, 20: *γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι.* For other quotations, comp. also Anger, *Synopsis*, 1852, pp. 204, 274. Justin, *Tryph.* 47: *ἐν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς καταλάβω, ἐν τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ.* 2 Clem. 4: *ἐὰν ἦτε μετ' ἐμοῦ συνηγμένοι ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου καὶ μὴ ποιῆτε τὰς ἐντολάς μου, ἀποβαλῶ ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν, κ. τ. λ.* There is nothing to show that either here or in capp. 5, 8, we are to think of the Gospel of the Egyptians, as in cap. 12 and at the end of cap. 9.

[2] *Haer.* 1, 20; Epiph. xxxiv. 8. Comp. Fabricius, *Cod. ap. N. T.*, I. p. 333: *πολλάκις ἐπεθύμησα ἀκοῦσαι ἕνα τῶν λόγων τούτων καὶ οὐκ ἔσκον τὸν ἐροῦντα.*

second century. John is said to have related the sayings of the Lord concerning the times of the kingdom of God: The days will come in which vines shall grow each having 10,000 shoots, and each shoot 10,000 branches, and each branch 10,000 twigs, and each twig 10,000 clusters, and to each cluster 10,000 grapes, and each grape which is crushed will yield twenty-five measures of wine. And when one of the saints shall reach after one of these clusters, another will cry, "I am a better cluster than it; take me, and praise the Lord because of me." Likewise, a grain of wheat will produce 10,000 ears, each ear 10,000 grains, each grain ten pounds of fine white flour. And so on, in like proportion, with other fruits, seeds, and herbs. The whole animal world, feeding upon the food which the ground brings forth, will live together in peace and mutual forbearance, and with perfect docility will be subject to man.[1] These parables and teachings of the Lord, this millenial, post-resurrection, material kingdom of God, described by Papias, and accepted by Irenæus and numberless others on the authority of the "ancient man," were discredited as myths and strange misconceptions of apostolic tradition by Eusebius, who loudly censures the author, to whom in other respects he paid so much deference. And we also are in a position, on the ground of Jesus' spiritual immaterialistic conception of the kingdom of God, of the unfantastic character of his mind, and, finally, of his severe reticence as to the things of the future, to detect the fictions which have been coarsely spun out of his predictions and parables.[2]

Thus we derive very little or nothing from those traditions of even the earliest Fathers, which have been too highly estimated by R. Hofmann. And were we to devote ourselves to the task of re-producing the first "Life of Jesus" as it was known in the age of the Fathers, and as it is to some extent given in the first book of Eusebius' History of the Church, we might indeed learn

[1] Irenæus, *Haer.* 5, 33, 3, 4 (ib. Judas the traitor doubted, hence said Jesus, Videbunt, qui venient in illa).

[2] Comp. Eus. 3, 39, and the change of opinion as compared with 3, 36.

many things from a diligent use of Josephus and other ancient works, but we should have to take into the bargain quite as many fables, inverted relations, and incorrect dates, and, above all, a totally unreal view of the life of "the Godhead."

Among the many evangelical writings independent of the four canonical ones, are several that are very ancient, but of which fragments only are extant. One is the "Jewish" Gospel of the Hebrews, also called the Gospel of Peter, or of the Twelve Apostles, and separating into the two main divisions of the Gospel of Nazarenes and the Gospel of the Ebionites. Another is the Gospel of the Egyptians.[1]

The Gospel of the Hebrews, the existence of which at the end of the second century is attested, and traces of which are to be found at least as far back as the middle of that century, runs remarkably parallel to our first Gospel. Coming a hundred times into contact with the latter, written in Hebrew, tenaciously adhered to by the believing and tradition-observing Jews as the true and only Gospel, rather as the genuine Gospel of the Apostle Matthew, it has, from the time of Jerome downwards to Lessing, Baur, and Hilgenfeld, often been regarded as, or conjectured to be, the true original Matthew. On the other hand, and especially by modern criticism, this view has been combatted, and the work has been shown to be a later production, derived from our existing Matthew. To decide this question is the business of an Introduction to the New Testament; nevertheless, since the question remains undecided—especially since the publication of Hilgenfeld's new apology for this work in 1863—it behoves us to determine for ourselves whether the life of Jesus is to rely more upon this Gospel, or upon that which was early preferred by the Church, and according to many is an older, is even the oldest Gospel of all—our Matthew.[2]

[1] Comp. Origen, *Hom. in Luc.* i.: Ecclesia habet iv. ev., hæresis *plurima.* Irenæus, 3, 11, 9.

[2] The fragments collected by Grabe, *Spicil. patr.* I. pp. 25 sqq. Fabricius, I. pp. 346 sqq. Credner, *Beiträge*, I. pp. 380 sqq. De Wette, *Einl. ins. N. T.*, 6th

It is no longer possible to determine, with absolute precision, the question of priority of date between the Hebrew Matthew and our Matthew. On behalf of the former can be pleaded the conservative spirit of Jewish Christianity, the ancient ecclesiastical tradition of an original Hebrew Matthew, the copious use made of the Gospel of the Hebrews by the writers of the Church, and, finally, the very perceptible fact that here and there it harmonizes not only with our Matthew, but also with Luke and John, and so far might be regarded as the original source whence they obtained their material. On the other hand, on behalf of our Matthew, we have, besides the preference accorded to it by the Church, its increasingly recognized genuinely Greek origin, with the consequent decisive rejection of the old assumption of its being a translation from the Hebrew; and chiefly, we have its strongly marked superiority over the still recognizable fragments of the Gospel of the Hebrews. And herein lies the decision of the question. We are unacquainted with the original form of the Gospel of the Hebrews, and are therefore compelled to suspend our verdict; but, on the other hand, the form of the Gospel, as we actually find it from the middle of the second century downwards, most evidently bears the marks of a later composition than our Matthew, and the further we trace it downwards through the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, the more evident and the more undeniable these marks are. It is by no means an evidence of the critical sagacity which Hilgenfeld has elsewhere exhibited, that instead of assigning the different strata of this Gospel to their respective centuries, he masses them together, and vehemently claims for it in its latest form, as it existed in the time of Jerome, at the close of the fourth and beginning of the fifth centuries, a superiority over our Matthew.

It must be admitted that, upon several points, the Gospel of

ed., 1860, pp. 97 sqq. Anger, *Synopse*, 1852. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift*, 1863. Now also in his *N. T. extra canonem receptum*, fasc. iv. *Librorum deperditorum fragmenta*, 1866.

the Hebrews has faithfully given, has even corrected, the evangelical text, so that our Matthew is sometimes explained and sometimes improved by it; in some of the sayings of Jesus it has made use of the more ancient form, the form which the writers of the second century preferred; but by far the greater number of the extant fragments show an infinite lack of the simplicity and originality which characterize our Matthew. It is generally believed that, as early as the middle of the second century, Justin Martyr drew material from the Gospel of the Hebrews; but if what he says concerning the birth of Jesus in a cave, his skill in carpentry, the fire-attested baptism-miracle at the Jordan, is to be found also in this Gospel—as, in fact, the first and third incidents were to be read therein at least at a later date—does this prove that the Gospel was the original source? Then, at the end of the second century, Clement of Alexandria borrowed from this Gospel the saying, "He who marvels shall rule, and he who rules shall enter into rest,"—a saying which, in its bombastic obscurity, reminds one of the Apocrypha, and particularly of the style of the Gospel of the Egyptians.[1] Finally, in the beginning of the third century, Origen derives from this Gospel an account given by Jesus himself of a journey made by him through the air, held suspended by the Holy Ghost by one of his mother's hairs; and also an infinitely commonplace story of two kingdoms, which appears to be nothing more than a coarse paraphrase of Matt. xix. 16, &c.[2] These are the earliest traces of this Gospel. It sinks still deeper into the apocryphal and the historically worthless, in the form in which it presents itself to Jerome, a century and a half later. The baptism of Jesus, who in the presence of his mother and brethren resisted being led to the Jordan, on the ground that he was sinless; the descent of the Spirit, who had rested upon none of the prophets; the resurrection of Jesus, who gave his grave-clothes to the high-priest's servant; the appearance of

[1] *Strom.* 2, 9, § 45: ὁ θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαήσεται.

[2] See the passages in De Wette, p. 98.

Jesus to his brother James, who had eaten nothing since the last supper (at which, in fact, he was not present), and now had to sit with him at table;—these and other things exhibit at once so much deliberate, rigid dogmatism, and highly-wrought, unhistorical colouring, that one is scarcely tempted to give to these startling "objective realities" (*Anschaulichkeiten*) of Hilgenfeld the credit of originality.[1] With the exception of these stories, which will be further noticed in this work, the peculiar sayings of Jesus preserved in this Gospel are of no great moment. Perhaps the most important is the following, mentioned by Jerome: "Never rejoice, unless you have looked upon your brother in love."[2] But how completely even the sayings are permeated by a later dogmatizing manner, is seen in the addition to the injunction given to Peter to forgive an offender seventy times seven: "For even in the prophets, after they had been anointed by the Holy Spirit, was there found mention of sin."[3] It is enough for the present to point out these facts; we need not here discuss the Jewish motives for this later form of Gospels.

Still further removed from originality was the Hebrew Gospel of the most exclusive Jewish party, the Ebionites, the fragments of which have been handed down to us from the end of the fourth century by Epiphanius.[4] In individual instances, as in the account of the baptism, the original form of the Gospel of the Hebrews is perhaps better preserved here than in Jerome's Gospel of the Nazarenes; but otherwise, the narrative of Mat-

[1] De Wette, pp. 101 sq.

[2] Et numquam, inquit, laeti sitis, nisi quum fratrem vestrum videritis in caritate. *Comm. Eph.* 5, 3.

[3] De Wette, p. 102. Of the sayings in the Gospel of the Hebrews there remains to be mentioned: Eligam mihi bonos, illos bonos, quos pater meus cœlestis dedit. Hilg. *l. c.* fasc. iv. pp. 16, 22 (from Eus. Theoph.); Ewald has noticed the Johannine stamp, *Jahrb.* VI. pp. 40 sqq. Related to, if not identical with, the saying in the text, is that in Jerome on Ezekiel xviii. 7: Inter maxima ponitur crimina, qui fratris sui spiritum contristaverit. The corresponding passage to Matt. v. 17, in *Tract. Shabb.* cap. 16 (Hilg. pp. 21 sq.), is simply the favourite false exegesis of the πληρῶσαι (= addere) of our text by Christians and Jews.

[4] Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. For a collection of them, see especially De Wette, pp. 98 sqq.

thew is already supplemented by passages from Luke, and the peculiar standpoint of the party is recklessly introduced. The preface of the Twelve Apostles is unhistorical. The miraculous early history is struck out, as the Ebionites believed in the natural birth of Jesus. They have given expression to their abstinence from animal food by putting a forced construction upon the words of our Matthew and Luke. They have supported their remarkable, half-Essenic, half-Christian aversion to sacrifice, by a saying of Jesus' which he could not have uttered, and which points plainly enough to a time subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem: "I am come to abolish sacrifice, and unless you cease to sacrifice, wrath against you will not cease."[1]

Several fragments of the Gospel of the Egyptians have been preserved chiefly by Clement of Alexandria, and in the second Epistle of Clement of Rome; it must therefore have existed tolerably early, at any rate as early as the middle of the second century. "When cometh the kingdom of Christ? When two are one, outer is inner, the man with the woman is neither man nor woman." "I am come to destroy the works of the woman." Jesus is said to have spoken thus to Salome: "If you trample under foot the garment of shame!" And in answer to her question, how long death would reign, he said, "As long as women bear children." Again, when she reckoned herself blessed because she had not borne children, he said: "Eat every plant, but not that one which is bitter." These sayings exhibit no trace of the Lord; his precepts were not characterized by subtle refining, and he did not teach that the salvation of the world was to be found in mere continence. The Gospel of the Egyptians is the work of a gloomy, self-mortifying ascetic, and the early Church rejected it on account of its asceticism and its obscure mysteries.[2]

[1] Epiph. xxx. § 16: *ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὰς θυσίας καὶ ἐὰν μὴ παύσησθε τοῦ θύειν, οὐ παύσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ ὀργή.*

[2] Clem. *Strom.* 3, 9, 13; 2 Clem. 12. Comp. Schneckenburger, *Ueber das Ev. der Ægyptier*, 1834. The fragments in Grabe, I. pp. 35 sqq.; Fabricius, I. pp. 335 sqq.; De Wette, pp. 118 sq. The saying about right and left, in Pseudolinus, *De*

It is a significant fact that, as far as can be discovered from these Gospels and from the untenable notices in the writings of the Fathers, at the end of a hundred years after Christ every independent and really valuable tradition concerning this life, outside of our Gospels, is extinguished; and that nothing more than a growing mass of fables runs, as a pretended supplement, by the side of the latter. This impression is fully confirmed by a glance at the still extant—after so many salutary losses (for who did not write Gospels?)—rich collection of complete Apocryphal Gospels or writings of an evangelical character, dating from the second century downwards, even after we have made a thankful surrender of the later and latest productions of this class of literature—productions which reach down to the Middle Ages, and are full of extravagant perversions. This literature has been collected by Fabricius, and more recently by Thilo and Tischendorf; and has also been reviewed and translated into German by Rud. Hofmann, in his "Life of Jesus according to the Apocrypha."[1] The individual works are based entirely upon our Gospels; but they aim at gratifying the pious and profane curiosity, the vivid imagination, and the love of the marvellous, of their age, by a more minute description of the most important and obscure portions of the outward life of Jesus—his extraction and birth, the years of his childhood, the names of those by whom he was surrounded, his death, resurrection, and ascension; here and there also they furnish support to orthodox or heterodox opinions. Very rarely indeed do they contain anything that can be made use of, and when they do, their contributions are still of a doubtful character, and belong, moreover, to the history of the Church, not to the life of Jesus; or they belong to the latter only so far as they, by their shadows, bring out the light of our

pass. Petri (Fabr. p. 335), and in 2 Clem. 8, fin., cannot be dated earlier than this Gospel. On the Gospel of the Egyptians, comp. also Hilgenfeld, *l. c.* pp. 43 sqq.

[1] Fabricius, *Cod. ap. N. T.* I. II. 1703, III. 1719. Thilo, *C. A. N. T.* I., 1832. Tischendorf, *Ev. Apocrypha*, 1853. Ibid. *De Ev. ap. origine et usu*, 1851. Hofmann, *Das L. J. nach den Apokryphen*, 1851. Comp. the article *Pseudepigraphen des N. T.* in Herzog.

Gospels into clearer relief, or, in the most favourable cases, so far as in those contributions certain points of view of our Gospels have received a plastic, though for the most part a rude amplification. In these respects they can claim attention from the writer of the life of Jesus.

We will therefore glance hastily at the oldest of these writings. The Gospel of James, the Gospel of Thomas, and the Acts of Pilate, date back to the second century. Later additions are by no means wanting, but the earliest traces of the first of these books are found in Justin and Clement of Alexandria, while Origen mentions it by name. The Gospel of Thomas also, to which Irenæus first refers, is known to Origen by name. The Acts of Pilate was first mentioned by Justin, then by Tertullian and Eusebius. The Gospel of James narrates the two miraculous births, that of Mary herself, and that of Jesus, in a medley of beautiful and revolting fancies. Thomas unfolds the miraculous world of the childhood and boyhood of Jesus, who, in this book, altogether ceases to be human. The Acts of Pilate, following our Gospels, John inclusive, narrates the condemnation of the innocent one, for whom Pilate and the Roman ensigns, the sick who had been healed, friends and foes, all plead; then come the resurrection and ascension, the reality of which occurrences is attested by witnesses of every kind, even by Annas and Caiaphas. A number of other writings and legends—a report of Pilate's (Anaphora Pilati), the condemnation of Pilate after he had been imprisoned by Tiberius, Tiberius's proposal to the Roman Senate to place Jesus among the gods, which is mentioned by Tertullian—have been incorporated into these Acts, which book itself, since the fifth century, has been joined to the equally ancient descent of Christ into hell (descensus ad inferos) to form the so-called Gospel of Nicodemus.[1]

[1] See the references in Tischendorf, *De Ev. ap. orig. et usu*, 1851. The *Acta Pilati* already in Justin, *Ap.* I. 35. The inimical *Acta* of the period of the persecutions in the fourth century, Eus. 1, 9, 11; 9, 5, 7. Tertullian's account of Tiberius, *Apolog.* 5, 21. Eus. 2, 2. *Chron. pasch.* ed Dind., I. p. 430.

The correspondence of Jesus with the prince (Toparch) Abgarus of Edessa, in Syria, which was regarded as authentic by Eusebius, and was copied from the local archives, and faithfully translated by him, must date from the third century. Compared with the rest of the correspondence ascribed to Jesus—with Peter and Paul, for example—this certainly appears to be one of the earliest and best specimens. As Naaman the Syrian had once appealed to Elisha, so Abgarus implores the physician of the blind and the lame, who was God, or the Son of God, to heal his sickness, and offers him, persecuted by the Jews of Jerusalem, a humble but friendly asylum in Edessa. Jesus sends answer, in the language of John the beloved disciple, to him who has not seen yet believes, that he has not time to go to him, but that after the accomplishment of his work, and when he has returned to his Father, he will send one of his disciples. It is said that a disciple went.[1]

The Gospel of the pseudo-Matthew, which appeared in the time of Jerome, and the History of Joseph the Carpenter, bring us down much later—at the earliest, into the fifth century. They assume the previous existence, not only of our Gospels, but also of the beginnings of the fabulous Gospels of James and Thomas, and Matthew in particular is in a certain sense a combination and amplification of James and Thomas. The life and death of Joseph, narrated on the Mount of Olives by Jesus himself, who is full of bitter sadness because even Joseph and Mary shared the common doom of human mortality, but also full of Christian triumph, may be counted among the best of these attempts, but nevertheless as one which, being the mere drapery of later dogmatic ideas, is historically useless.

Altogether undeceived by such an endless, unproductive, misleading world of legends, which vainly promised and would still promise us facts, authentic sayings, even epistles and imperishable memorials, we escape from the lying magic, to seek a last support and help in the sources afforded by the New Testament,

[1] Eus. 1, 13.

in our Gospels.[1] We take refuge here with the greater confidence because the ruins which lie around the ancient archives of the Church look like a guarantee of the enduring greatness and strength of those archives themselves. And yet, in the general overthrow, doubt lays its hand even upon these; and every one knows how stoutly, notwithstanding the fate of former attempts, clamorous doubt attacks the very bulwark of Christianity.

II.—New Testament Sources.

Though even here it is impossible to banish doubt altogether, though even here it is necessary to leave some questions undecided, to acknowledge deficiencies, to beat retreats, perhaps even to establish once and for ever the fact of the spontaneous disintegration of the accredited sources; nevertheless, in this way, we shall at the very outset gain firm ground for our feet, where we may refresh ourselves after our fatigue, and gather new courage for the trials and sacrifices of another critical campaign. In order to gain this firm footing, and with it a safer basis for future action, it is necessary, in the present day, to begin, not with the Gospels, but with the earlier and less doubtful writings of the Apostle Paul.

A.—*The Testimony of Paul.*

We have no earlier witness than Paul; we will therefore bring together under his name all our oldest testimony, adding to his, by way of supplement, such other contributions to the life of Jesus contained in the New Testament, as are older than the Gospels.

The date of his conversion to Christianity is variously fixed by different writers, opinions ranging between A.D. 31—41, but it is now generally placed between A.D. 36—38. This is not the place to enter into this question. It is quite sufficient

[1] The so-called monument to Jesus at Paneas, Eus. 7, 18.

for us to know that, from the year 40 to the year 64, the year of his death under the Emperor Nero, Paul preached Jesus the Christ to the Roman world from east to west. Paul's ministry and that of Jesus were not separated by more than a decade at the most; according to our opinion, if Jesus died in the year 35, and Paul was converted in the year 37, only two years lay between. Indeed, it is at present the conviction of many critics that Paul saw and heard the Lord himself, though without believing in him; and this supposition is not necessarily founded merely upon 2 Cor. v. 16, but rather on the general course of the life of the Apostle, who, according to all evidences, spent his youth in Jerusalem, and remained there until, in his riper age, he witnessed the execution of the first Christian martyr, Stephen, and until his own conversion in the storm which overtook him on the way to Damascus. He must, therefore, with his teachers, the Pharisees, have interested himself in the new Galilean prophet from the time of the disputations in the temple to that of the crucifixion.[1]

The conversion of Paul was certainly not brought about by his personal knowledge of the earthly Jesus, nor by a later acquaintance with his teaching and actions; but rather by faith in a manifestation of the glorified one from heaven, and by the inner revelation of God concerning the Son of God. Paul's faith in Christ at all times derived its strength more from inner than external facts. The whole of his Christianity and his apostolic teaching consisted, therefore, of a cycle of doctrines built upon faith in a Messiah who had already come and had been seen by him in glory, rather than of a mere faithful echo of the words and works of the historical Jesus, like the Christianity of the other Apostles. Not only does he very rarely give us literally

[1] Olshausen, Niedner, Ewald, Beyschlag, Diestelmann, have expressed themselves for Paul's acquaintance with Jesus; Baur, Renan, Hilgenfeld, against. The passage, 2 Cor. v. 16, does not allow us to give to the *knowing* (kennen), the force of *mentally comprehending* (auffassen): the qualifying clause is purely concessive, and the dominant subject in *we* is the Apostle. But the fact of Paul's presence in Jerusalem in the life-time of Jesus gives to the passage the force of a proof.

the sayings and actions of Jesus, while his busy mind is occupied in deducing far-reaching and infinite conclusions from the simplest facts connected with the death and resurrection of Jesus; but he so weaves the actual and the ideal together, so converts facts into ideas and ideas into facts, that in the hands of the critic even the facts seem to fade into mere ideas. Thus it has come to pass that his testimony has sunk in value, and that of late the subtlest critics have objected to arguments based upon Paul's writings, on the ground that such arguments translate scraps of thought into facts, stones into bread.[1]

In this, however, there is not a little exaggeration. Paul was not indifferent to historical facts. It should be remembered that information concerning the life of Jesus sometimes offered itself to him, sometimes forced itself upon him, in Jerusalem, in Damascus and Antioch, in the person of an Ananias, a Barnabas, a Silas, a Philip, and a Mnason, as well as in the persons of the Apostles and Christians of the holy city; and it is by no means a proof of a long-continued indifference to the history with which he had from the beginning been partially acquainted, that, at the close of the third year after his conversion, he travelled to Jerusalem with the express object of becoming acquainted with Peter, and of learning from him, certainly not merely his principles, but the details of his intercourse with Jesus. It is, however, quite enough to know what his Epistles reveal. In them, importance is attached to Christian tradition; from them, it by no means appears as if he were satisfied with the general facts of the crucifixion, the burial, and the resurrection.[2] For the married and the single, he seeks for the injunctions of Christ with reference to even the minutest detail of marriage and celibacy; as to the dead and the living, he knows what Jesus has said concerning his return; with reference to the outer lives

[1] Comp. Baur, *Jahrb.* 1852, p. 38: Word of Christ = the True; or the modern opinions concerning Paul's assertion of the descent of Jesus from David, my *Gesch. Christus*, p. 78. Paul is correctly estimated in the excellent treatise by Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, *Jahrbb. f. Deutsche Theol.* iii. 1858. Comp. Weizsäcker, pp. 6 sqq.

[2] Traditions, 1 Cor. xi. 1, xv. 1—3.

of the Apostles, he has independent moral maxims, which are so much the more suggestive of the sayings of Jesus, because Paul's moral ground-conception of the kingdom of God could not have been acquired without a definite acquaintance with the teaching of Jesus.[1] The author of the Acts of the Apostles has put into the mouth of Paul a noble saying of the Lord's, which is to be found neither in the Gospels nor in the Apostle's Epistles: "It is more blessed to give than to receive."[2] Finally, upon the most decisive points of Christian doctrine—the questions as to the significance of the death of Jesus and the reality of his resurrection—Paul has given such an amount of faithful historical information and weighty historical evidence, that his contributions rank with the Gospel histories, and are superior to the earliest conceptions of the apostolic age concerning the death of Jesus.[3] The life of Jesus must have been far more richly at his command than is now apparent; for, in his Epistles, he always assumes that the elements of tradition, the delineation of the figure of Christ, stand before the eyes of his readers; and moreover, it was a mental characteristic of his, instead of narrating facts themselves, to throw those facts at once into a system.[4] Where, in his repeated references to the significance and purpose of the cross of Christ, has Paul spoken of authentic declarations made by Jesus himself? We owe it to an accident—the disorders at the Corinthian love-feasts—that a picture of the historical last supper of Jesus is unfolded before us, a picture which shows that the purpose of Jesus was in perfect harmony with the Apostle's preaching of the cross. Where, in his demands for a new, Christian course of life, in his proclamations of a holy kingdom of God, has Paul spoken of the precepts of Jesus? We owe it to an accident—the doubts at Corinth concerning mar-

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25; 1 Thess. iv. 15; 1 Cor. ix. 14. Comp. Rom. x. 10 with Matt. x. 32. Similar sayings, *e.g.* Rom. xii. 14 sqq.; 1 Thess. v. 2.

[2] Acts xx. 35.

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 1 sqq.

[4] The communities were to hold fast the traditions, 1 Cor. xi. 1, xv. 1—3. Delineation of Christ, Gal. iii. 1. Σοφία ἐν τοῖς τελείοις, 1 Cor. ii. 6.

riage—that the Apostle's acquaintance with the moral world of Jesus is indisputably revealed.

It would even be easy to show that Paul was *compelled* to satisfy his own mind, historically and critically. His conversion had to struggle into existence through *doubt and denial*, and his mental character was pre-eminently logical; he was never happy until his ideas were firmly established, until he had arrived at positive conclusions, and had anticipated all objections. Shall we suppose that he believed in the Messiah, and yet had troubled himself either not at all, or only superficially and generally, about those facts which must support or overthrow his faith? We are thus led to two important conclusions. In the first place, the Apostle's faith must have rested, not upon the meagre notices of the person of Jesus which we find in his writings, but upon a knowledge of his life sufficiently comprehensive to justify all the results of his reasoning, and to present to his mind, either on the ground of his own observation or that of others, the picture of a character without spot and full of nobility. And, in the second place, this knowledge of the Apostle's is not the fruit of a blind acceptance of unexamined Christian tradition, picked up here and there, but, as the case of his inquiry into the evidences of the resurrection shows, was arrived at by means of a lucid, keen, searching, sceptical observation, comparison, collection and collation of such materials as were accessible to him. It does not follow that he was therefore a perfect and infallible critic: he bore the stamp of his age and nation, and his very faith in the Messiah rendered him an easy victim to many an historical assumption.

But, after all, is it true that facts and ideas are inseparably intermixed in Paul's writings? It must be here conceded that, to the Apostle, the pre-existence of the Messiah, his incarnation, the purpose of his death—viz. the abrogation of the Law, the calling of the heathen, the gift of the sonship of God—are as much matters of fact as Jesus' birth, death and resurrection; that ideas and conclusions are at once converted by him into facts

which we cannot directly accept as such. Such instances of confusion, however, are not only rare, but they offer no stumbling, and are capable of rectification. Pre-temporal history makes no claim to be history in a strict sense, but is merely the strong conviction of the author. And when a haziness exists in the temporal history of Jesus—as, perhaps, is the case in the definition of the purpose of his death, where the Apostle seems to draw to some extent upon the later facts of Christianity and of the Christian consciousness—it must be remembered that Paul saw, in those later facts, the carrying out of the will of the glorified Head of the Church, and hence continuation of his real history; whilst we, supported by the Apostle himself, are in a position to distinguish more sharply between the history of the temporal and that of the glorified Jesus. But when, apart from this admixture of pre-temporal and post-temporal history, the Apostle makes a number of assertions concerning the temporal life of Jesus, and makes them in a purely historical manner, without far-reaching definitions of purpose, shall we then complain of a confusion of facts and ideas; and is it possible to suppose that he would give a dogmatic colouring to facts, in cases in which the actual fact could alone have any significance to himself and others, and in which the fact was capable of being fully verified by friend and foe?

What, then, did Paul know of the life of Jesus? That he was a man born, like ourselves, of a woman; that he was an Israelite of the house of David, and from his birth grew up under the Law; that though poor in worldly wealth, yet for the good of mankind he became in truth the Christ, nay, the Son of God.[1] Strong in spirit, weak in the flesh, which was like our own, he sinned neither in thought nor in deed; satisfied, as no one else ever did, God's demand for righteousness; served Israel in love, chose apostles for Israel, furnishing them with instructions and especially with power for their office, including the power of

[1] Comp. Gal. iv. 4; Rom. i. 3, 4, v. 12, sqq., ix. 5; 2 Cor. viii. 9.

working signs and wonders, delivered moral precepts, and proclaimed a moral kingdom of God.[1] His attitude towards the Law and the heathen, the most important question of later times, is not directly touched upon. So much is certain, that Paul in his great struggles for the rights of the heathen, for freedom from the Law in Christ, does not appeal to the words of Jesus, nay, that he expressly mentions the historical limitation of the ministry of Jesus to Israel, and his standing under the Law from his birth to his death.[2] At the same time he is also acquainted with commands and rules of Jesus not to be found in the Law, even of a "law of Christ," to which he subjects himself whilst he rejects the law of Moses; nay, he goes so far as to speak of a "new covenant," which Jesus, in express words, declared to be founded upon his death, after the pattern of the old, and of the design of Jesus to deliver men by his death from the Law, and to reconcile to God not only the Jews, but even the heathen world also.[3] When mentioning this view of the purpose of the death of Jesus, we have readily admitted that Paul derived it from the circumstances of the time at which he was writing; we can now add that this after-interpretation could not, however, directly contradict the facts of the earthly life of Jesus. The historical Jesus, whom he had known, might actually have been his whole life long under the Law, might have restricted himself to serving Judaism; there must, notwithstanding, have been in him—in his doings and words—something reaching beyond, something more comprehensive than Judaism and its Law to justify Paul in defining the purpose of his death so purely in the sense of a passing over the national limitations, and the national subjection of the foregoing life of

[1] 2 Cor. iii. 17, xiii. 4; Rom. viii. 3; 2 Cor. v. 21; Rom. v. 18, 19, xv. 8. Apostles, Gal. ii. 7 sq.; 1 Cor. ix. 14; 2 Cor. xii. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 10 sqq.; comp. vi. 9; Gal. v. 21.

[2] Rom. xv. 8; Gal. iv. 4, &c.

[3] 1 Cor. vii. 10, sqq.; ibid. ix. 21; Rom. viii. 2. New Covenant, 1 Cor. xi. 25; essentially also Matt. xxvi. 28. The purpose, Gal. iii. 13, &c.

Jesus in the sense of an act of complete self-sacrifice. The perfectly convincing proof lies, indeed, in the independent commands of Jesus, to which Paul appeals, and in the expression with an infinite perspective, which he quotes from the mouth of Jesus—the New Covenant. His whole conception is the better realized when we remember that the Hellenistic tradition of the life of Jesus, to the influence of which he was chiefly exposed, represented Jesus—as the characteristic speech of Stephen shows—as holding an essentially Jewish position, and yet at the same time as exhibiting an elevation above the outward ordinances of the Law, nay, above Judaism itself.[1] Thus Paul's silence as to any non-legalistic and heathen-favouring sayings of Jesus, does not by any means justify the over-hasty conclusion of many representatives of the Tübingen school, that such sayings did not in truth exist, or that Paul was unable to find them, and that the original Apostles, with their tradition of the Law-observance and Judaism of Jesus, remained masters of the field; but, on the contrary, we are compelled to assume that the Apostle found in existence sayings of the two opposite kinds; that, for this very reason, viz., because there existed a divided, conflicting, and doubly one-sided tradition, he was silent about both kinds of sayings, but constructed out of both the sublime view that Jesus, on the one hand, with self-denying condescension, really subjected himself to the Jewish Law, and, on the other hand, proclaimed the abrogation of its narrow ordinances, in the name of the human race, whom his death was to set free. This question, the detailed treatment of which may surprise many readers, cannot be too carefully investigated; for upon it hangs the character of primitive Christianity and our verdict concerning the Gospels.

Paul knew, further, that the life of Jesus was crowned with death and resurrection. Given up into the hands of his enemies, the ruling authorities of the people, he was, in his human

[1] Comp. Acts vi. 13 sqq.

weakness, crucified, slain, and buried.[1] In truth, however, in his self-renunciation and love to mankind, he gave himself up for sinners, for whom no one else would die, whilst *he* took them to himself and upon himself, in doing which he endured the revilings of blasphemers, and presented his body and blood as a pure paschal offering; nay, as an atoning sacrifice for Israel and for all men.[2] Accordingly, on the night of his betrayal, he celebrated the Passover with his disciples in such a manner that, under the symbols of bread and wine, he offered to them his body, which he dedicated to them, and the New Covenant which was to be founded upon his blood; and he prescribed to them the perpetual repetition of this observance in remembrance of him.[3] But the dead rose again; on the third day, according to the Scriptures, he was restored to life by God, and appeared to a series of witnesses, who can be reckoned and classified—Peter, James, the Apostles, five hundred brethren, and lastly, Paul himself; he was exalted to the right hand of God, whence, as Lord of all men through his resurrection, he would speedily return, according to his own promise, the judge and king of the quick and the dead.[4]

The Apostle's independent system of ideas, resting as it does upon the traditional facts of the life of Jesus, is itself a new and eloquent testimony to the immense interest felt in the person of Jesus immediately after his departure, and even while the bloody traces of a criminal death were still fresh. The highest conceptions of Messianic dogmatics, of the Alexandrian philosophy, scarcely suffice to express, in human language, the fulness and height of this being. Much more than a mere man had been present in him; he was the peculiar Son of God, the perfect image of God, whom God sent forth from the midst of heavenly riches into earthly poverty; by him the world was made, by

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 23, ii. 8, v. 7; comp. xi. 23 sqq; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 3.

[2] Gal. ii. 20; Rom. v. 6 sqq., xv. 3, 7; 1 Cor. v. 7; Rom. iii. 25; Gal. iii. 13.

[3] 1 Cor. xi. 23 sqq.

[4] 1 Cor. xv. 1 sqq; Rom. viii. 34, xiv. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 15.

him Israel was led in the wilderness; finally, he appeared upon earth miraculously to verify all the promises God had made from the beginning, and to introduce mankind into the second and last epoch of the divine creation; he was the second man, after Adam, the heavenly, spiritual, ideal man, who should subdue the flesh, sin, and death in humanity, that was to be newly-created after his image, and even in the lower creation, and who should bring in the liberty of the children of God, and should effect the permanent and complete return of the world to God.[1]

The life of Jesus, as presented to us by Paul, is indeed rich in material—a Gospel of the first days—and one which, in spite of its insoluble difficulties, would enable us to dispense with any further Gospel; or rather, one which promises illustration and assistance of every kind to our Gospels, with their actual flesh and blood of the life of Jesus. To one firm position, a second readily attaches itself.

Paul's facts are more or less echoed in all the other Epistles and writings of the New Testament. For example, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the first Epistle of Peter strikingly exhibit the genuinely human suffering and the wrestling Gethsemane agony, and they also preserve to us our sinless prototype.[2] But, for the most part, these writings contain only incidental allusions, and their precise age is not firmly established. Relatively the most copious and best attested contributions are given in the Revelation of John, written at the end of the year 68, shortly after the death of Paul; and next stands the Acts of the Apostles, the second half of the work of the evangelist Luke, dating from about A.D. 80—90. In the Revelation, the Jewish-Christian author of which, however, can hardly have been an eye-witness of the life of Jesus, or indeed an apostle, Jesus is the Son of God and Son of Man, of the tribe of Judah, of the house of David, the proto-martyr, the first-fruits of the dead, the Lamb

[1] Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 44, viii. 6, x. 4, 9; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Rom. viii. 3, 32.

[2] Heb. ii. 17 sq., iv. 15, especially v. 7 sqq.; 1 Peter ii. 21.

that was slain, who loved us and by his blood has redeemed and purified both Jews and heathen, but who, after his three days' disgrace at Jerusalem, conquered by his resurrection, is henceforth the equal of God at God's right hand, and will speedily come in the clouds of heaven, as judge and ruler, bringing the heavenly Jerusalem down to earth.[1] The historical material contained in the Acts of the Apostles is much richer, and its worth consists in the fact that it does not simply repeat the Gospel narrative, but confirms, enlarges, or modifies it out of numerous earlier Jewish-Christian and Hellenistic sources. We learn from it that, after John had preached baptism in Israel, Jesus of Nazareth, the servant of God, anointed with the Holy Spirit, gathered disciples together, began his essentially Israelitish ministry in Galilee, traversed the country to Jerusalem as a doer of good deeds and a worker of miracles of healing, especially to the possessed, he himself being the best illustration of his own saying, "It is more blessed to give than to receive;" that, finally, he was betrayed by his disciple Judas, was unjustly accused—he, the just and holy one—before Pilate by the rulers of the Jews, and, notwithstanding Pilate's intercession, was rejected by the people in favour of a murderer, and then crucified and buried. But, in truth, God had so ordained it, in order to exalt him to be the Christ, and through him, if not exactly through his cross, to grant salvation, peace, and forgiveness to men. On the third day he rose from the dead, showed himself alive for a length of time (for forty days according to one passage), not indeed to the people, but to his own followers, with whom, however, he ate and drank, and to whom, previous to his ascension, he delivered his last charges and promises, including the promise of his return.[2] This compilation (the Acts)

[1] Comp. Rev. v. 5, xxii. 16; ibid. i. 5, v. 6, 9, 12; ibid. i. 5, 8, ii. 8, xvii. 14, &c.

[2] Comp. especially Acts ii., iii., x., xiii.; the saying, xx. 35. That the death of Jesus, as such, has no saving efficacy, as it has in Paul's teaching, may be assumed to be a generally admitted fact; but neither can there be any doubt that Paul has hit upon the fundamental thought of Jesus himself.

is instructive even in its internal contradictions upon the most important points. According to one passage, which has probably received the impress of the Pauline author's sentiments, the departing Jesus commanded his disciples to preach to all the world, beginning at Jerusalem; according to other and Jewish-Christian notices, he commanded only a mission to the people of Israel. According to one passage, he was the prophet like unto Moses, whose words were to be regarded as of equal authority with those of Moses; according to a Hellenistic source, he either openly or secretly attacked and devoted to destruction the external ordinances of Moses, the commandments, and the temple itself.[1] These conflicting assertions remind us, not only of the later distinctions of parties, but also of that two-fold character of the facts of the life of Jesus itself, of which we have just found Paul to be a witness.

Though it is still possible that historical scrutiny may challenge many of these facts, yet we have watched the formation of a solid kernel of the life of Jesus, capable of resisting dissolution, and attested and established by the consensus of ancient witnesses upon many of the most important points.

B.—*The Four Gospels.*

Thus encouraged, we pass to the Gospel question, a question which both has been and still is the subject of eager discussion, and during the last hundred years has been as often declared to be solved as to be insoluble. Not that the whole historical life of Jesus is involved in this inquiry: what we have to do is merely, by the aid of fresh witnesses, once more to attest, and

[1] Universalism, Acts i. 8; comp. ii. 39; iii. 26, &c. On the contrary, x. 11 sqq., 28, 34—36, 39, 42, &c. Law, iii. 22, 23, and vi. 11, 13, 14, vii. 38, 44—50. Verses 38 and 44 show, at any rate, that Stephen maintained that the spiritual, and to some extent also the material, part of Mosaism was not abolished; he could thus the more emphatically insist upon the abolition of those excesses by which the ceremonial had been made an end in itself, as in the temple-worship and the sacrifices. And here he was in agreement with Jesus.

with their assistance to enlarge, the material of the life of Jesus furnished us in outline by Paul and other sources. For, however well satisfied we may be with the bold strokes of the Pauline monumental inscriptions, we can by no means dispense with a sure knowledge of the details of this influential life, and of the utterances which moved and are still moving the world. If possible, the one literature must be made the key to the other.

Gospel criticism is a distinct science. But it is a controversial science, and the life of Jesus, in seeking a foundation for itself, necessarily helps, in some degree at least, to build up that science, by supplying general points of view, and by watching over the work of criticism with an historical eye. There are two leading controversies with which Gospel criticism is at present hampered, and by which, in the opinion of men of little faith, all attempts to construct a life of Jesus are paralyzed. First, there is the question of preference between the three first Gospels and that of John; and, secondly, there is the question as to which of the three first is to be preferred to the other two, or more definitely, as the question stands at present, as to which is to have the preference, Matthew or Mark. We might, indeed, go back beyond our Gospels, and eagerly discuss, thirdly, the question of their earliest sources and the composition of those sources; but this, in the absence of any firm ground to stand upon, could lead to nothing but fruitless hypotheses. In pursuing the two inquiries we have marked out, we can set out from either of two starting-points, and in each case be conforming to custom—we can begin with the three first Gospels, or with the fourth, refuting, or more or less triumphantly justifying, one by the other. The best course is to begin with those Gospels which in their age and their views stand nearest to the Apostle Paul, and therefore to the time of Jesus himself. These are the three first Gospels, and we here begin with Matthew.

1.—*The Three First Gospels.*

It is the most firmly established teaching of all tradition, as well as of all independent investigation of the writings themselves, that the three first Gospels possess a higher antiquity than the fourth; and, further, as the ancient church saw, that there exists between them a fraternal relationship in their narrative, the characteristics of which are a stricter fidelity to tradition, an objective and popular treatment, consequently a prevailing agreement in general features as well as in details, an agreement often extending to the very words. They have on this account, like a three-fold reflection of one and the same picture, been studied together, and indeed have been in modern times so tabulated as to make their agreement visible to the eye. From this collective view (Synopsis) they have, since Griesbach, been called the Synoptics. This general harmony seems at first to justify belief in a copious, trustworthy, and ancient tradition of the life of Jesus. On the other hand, however, the discrepancies which are ever becoming more and more apparent to criticism, weaken this belief, or at least challenge explanation, or call for an attempt to discover that which is oldest among the old, that which is most trustworthy among the probable. Thus the collective view becomes a real anatomical dissection of the three organisms—of their traditions, as men formerly preferred to speak of them—of their standpoints, as men now say. Each of the three has had the honour of being in turn first, second, and third; whilst, at the same time, that which was placed first ran the further risk of being regarded, not as the true original, but only as the firstling among a series of reproductions of a lost and very venerable primitive Gospel. Amid this multiplicity of opinions, we uphold, in opposition to the now favourite and vigorously supported assumption of the absolute or relative originality of Mark, the old belief in Matthew, a belief still stoutly vindicated, especially by the Tübingen

critical school (Baur, Strauss, Schwegler, Zeller, Hilgenfeld); and we hold, moreover, the conviction that though this Gospel, in spite of the superiority of its arrangement over that of others, and especially of Luke, may also rest upon earlier and less skilfully constructed written sources, yet it is no longer possible (as it is, to some extent, in the case of Luke) to trace the way back with certainty and accuracy to this earliest source of all without resorting to pure hypothesis.[1]

(A).—Matthew.

Jesus neither took pen in hand himself to write his own memoirs (how could he have found time and occasion—he who, as the Son of God, had to manifest, to give, to sacrifice himself to mankind?) nor, when he delivered the Gospel to his disciples, did he commission them to write (Matthew x. 7). In his true and perfect humility, he was zealous for the maintenance of the letter of the Old Testament, but about his own he was careless, in the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount. But without such attempts to perpetuate the memory of himself as are characteristic of modern times, he needed not to be anxious about the future—he who was certain that his words would remain when the heavens had passed away (Matthew xxiv. 34), that they would survive all the opposition of the whole world (verse 14), and that even his act of anointing in the quiet village of Bethany would be ever remembered in sermons and conversation throughout the earth (xxvi. 13). In fact, this absence of anxiety on the part of Jesus has deprived us of the possession of a perfectly genuine, certain, and perpetually valid Gospel. We have merely scantier, later sources, and, with them, gnawing doubt; but, at the same time, we are thus saved from bondage to the sacred letter, and, moreover, even in these later sources

[1] It is to be understood, as a matter of course, that in what follows account is taken of the recent standard works on the question of the Synoptics, by Baur, Hilgenfeld, Köstlin, Bleek, Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, and others.

which reflect the great faith of the Lord, we recover that Lord himself, his person and his work, described sometimes on the spot and sometimes at a distance.

It is mere fable that, soon after the departure of Jesus—even in the time of Stephen, as Eichhorn, the father of the doctrine of a primitive Gospel, supposed—memoranda or first Gospels, whether by Matthew, or Philip, or by the College of Apostles, were in existence. For a long time, especially among the Jewish Christians, men were satisfied with oral reminiscences, while the Gentile Christian Church of Paul subsisted upon the fundamental facts; indeed, if the latter church longed for detailed Gospels, they were compelled to wait till the initiative had been taken by the best informed circle of believers, the Palestinians.

Here, in fact, at the fountain-head of the life of Jesus, growing needs made themselves felt during the second half of the apostolic age, from the Council of the Apostles to the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 53—70). On the one hand, a new generation sprang up; the Jews of Palestine as well as those of the dispersion, and even the Gentile world whose religious interests they guarded, longed for information concerning Jesus, and for a solution of the difficulties connected with a despised and crucified Messiah, who nevertheless, as the one who was to return, seemed to be the last friend, the last star of the declining Jerusalem. On the other hand, Paul, by preaching the abrogation of the Law and the cessation of the national privileges, called for an exact and detailed collection of the regulative utterances of the "Teacher," upon whose authority the Jewish Christian circles depended more immediately than did the Gentile church of the Spirit. Thus came into existence accounts of his royal descent, then apocalypses or compilations of his predictions concerning the future of Jerusalem and of the world in general, then collections of his words and deeds, especially of the events connected with the catastrophe at Jerusalem. In these collections, his words and deeds could hardly have been kept altogether distinct, because this would have been impossible, and

also because the Jews required both words and signs: that they were not separated is evident from the preface to Luke (i. 1).

In such a connection, and doubtless based on an already existing literature consisting chiefly of genealogies, apocalypses, sayings, and deeds (as Matthew and Luke show), appeared, shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, the broadly-designed and well-constructed Gospel of Matthew.

a.—*The Gospel as a Whole.*

In Gospel criticism, nothing has been more common than neglect of the chronological question. Let us at once reverse the order of things. The *chronological marks* of a literary work have the first right to speak, when the other evidences of origin and relationship are so obscure and at the same time controverted.

The first Gospel, substantially and in its unadulterated nucleus, was written before the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70). This can be shown by the absence of any intimation that the Jerusalem of the days of Jesus, which is the city of a great king, possessing the temple with its splendour of gold and stone-work, its altar and sacrifice, priests in their courses and religious parties, had ceased to exist when the author wrote.[1] Much can be adduced on the other side, and this in particular, that the destruction of the temple, one stone of which should not remain upon another, is nevertheless referred to.[2] But it is to be observed that references such as the above are found only in those predictions of Jesus which, in the form that he gave them or that they afterwards assumed, were by no means fulfilled. The city was burnt, but not by the armies of God; the temple was thrown down, but the catastrophe was not heralded by the setting up of altars of abomination, as in the days of Antiochus.

[1] Matt. v. 35, xxiii. 2 sqq., 16 sqq., xxii. 23, &c.

[2] Ibid. xxiv. 2, xxii. 7.

In the historical destruction of Jerusalem we see nothing of a flight of the people, the Christians included, out of the city that had suffered only the loss of its temple, or of the existence of an unusual number of false prophets with special powers of seduction, or, finally and chiefly, of an "immediate" return of Christ to end the short-enduring straits of the days during which the pious watched upon the mountains.[1]

It is indeed asserted that the illusion that the author writes apparently in the midst of the old and unchanged circumstances of the Jews, and before the destruction of the temple, is explicable simply from his fidelity as a narrator to the old histories, sayings, and other sources, even though the situation had long been changed, and many of the Lord's words had lost either their interest or their truth. This may be true in individual instances, but no narrator would encumber his whole history with obsolete stories; no believing Christian would trouble himself at large with predictions of Jesus which his experience had contradicted. The convincing evidence stands written in the other Gospels, which have toned down those predictions of Jesus that had become historically doubtful, and especially have suppressed the return "immediately" after the destruction of Jerusalem. It is simply incredible that the author of the first Gospel could have lived after the destruction of Jerusalem, and yet have placed the second coming "immediately" after that event, since in the midst of all the ardour of his momentary expectation (xxiv. 15) he found rest and leisure, not only for the

[1] These are the features of chap. xxiv., especially of verses 14—29. The *βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως ἑστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ*, xxiv. 15, can, from the expression and the historical reference to Daniel (comp. Jos. *Ant.* 12, 5, 4; 1 Macc. i. 54), be nothing but the heathen altar of abomination. Titus' offering of sacrifice to the ensigns (Jos. *B. J.* 6, 6, 1) took place at the close, not at the beginning, of the catastrophe; moreover, it was only a passing incident, and nothing is said of the erection of a heathen altar in the Temple. Again, the false prophets (comp. Jos. *B. J.* 6, 5, 2; 7, 11, 1) were not exactly deceivers (like those in Matt. xxiv. 24), though they were *ἐγκάθετοι παρὰ τῶν τυράννων*. The flight of the Jews and Christians took place earlier, Jos. *B. J.* 2, 20, 1; 2, 14, 2; 4, 6, 3; *Ant.* 20, 11, 1. The Christians, Eus. 3, 5.

composition of his Gospel, but also for an astute and politic extension of the "immediately" over one or two swiftly-fleeting decades. Many other indications point to the same date, before the destruction of Jerusalem. Thus we have numerous references to a return of Jesus to the generation then living, to the nation as it then existed with its hierarchy, to the living disciples, even to the apostles before they had extended their mission field beyond Palestine.[1] Even the locality of the field of blood, the fruit of the treachery of Judas, could still be identified, an impossibility, one would say, after the destruction.[2] Of much more weight is the mention of the tribute-money. Jesus pays the temple-tax, in order to avoid giving offence, though as the Son of the Father he is free, is equal and superior to the princes of royal houses, who pay no tax. After the year 71, the temple-tax was, by order of the Emperor Vespasian, transferred to Jupiter Capitolinus,—to the heathen gods. From that time both Jews and Jewish Christians would be scandalized at hearing the very name of the didrachma, at the payment by Jesus of the temple-tax, at his being unwilling to offend the heathen; and the story of the fish and the temple-tax has disappeared from all later Gospels, to the delight of those who share in the modern aversion to miracles, and who would so gladly get rid of this miracle of the fish.[3]

It has been maintained that Jesus could not possibly have so distinctly predicted the destruction of the temple. Conjecture could not extend to details; and, moreover, the author of the Revelation (A.D. 68), with all his knowledge concerning Jesus, and notwithstanding his proximity to the dreadful occurrence, anticipated merely the ruin of the outer courts, with the altar of

[1] Matt. xxiii. 36, 39, xxiv. 34, xxvi. 64, x. 23, xvi. 28, xix. 27 sqq.

[2] Ibid. xxvii. 8. On the other hand, however, there are doubts as to the antiquity of this passage. See below.

[3] Ibid. xvii. 24 sqq. Also *B. J.* 7, 6, 6 (in any case before the fourth year of Vespasian, *i.e.* 73). Suet. *Domit.* 12. Dio, cap. 66, 7.

burnt-offering, whilst the temple itself was to be divinely preserved.[1] The definite prediction of the destruction must be ascribed to the author who had survived it. As to this objection, it might be left an open question whether Jesus himself, or those who lived at a somewhat later time, foresaw the overthrow of the temple. Yet the former supposition is rendered unquestionable by a number of old traditions of the trial of Jesus, as well as later of that of Stephen.[2] Nor must it be forgotten that since the Romans had become masters, since it had been discovered that the antagonism between foreign rule and national obstinacy was irreconcilable, the old perspective of Jewish history and prophecy lay close at hand; and that, even in Jewish circles, there had been felt, from the middle of the century, a presentiment of the destruction of the city and the burning of the temple.[3] The calculation in the Revelation is no proof to the contrary; this characteristic Jewish bargaining, this giving up and keeping back, is best explained on the supposition that, either on account of the words of Jesus, or of men's own forebodings, the worst was already anticipated. To the other arguments for the later origin of Matthew, has also been added the employment of the Revelation itself by the evangelist. This would involve no inherent necessity for removing the date of this Gospel to the destruction of the city; but the traces of such an employment of the Revelation are by no means clear; while, on the other hand, the great simplicity, and consequently originality and independence, of the predictions of Jesus, are strikingly evident, when contrasted with the exaggerated visions of the future in the book of Revelation.[4]

[1] Rev. xi. 1 sqq.

[2] Comp. Matt. xxvi. 61; Mark xiv. 58; John ii. 19; particularly Acts vi. 14.

[3] Josephus dates the end from the procuratorship of Cumanus (A.D. 48); in his time the destruction of Jerusalem was already contemplated: see Jos. *B. J.* 2, 12, 5; *Ant.* 20, 16, 1. We can also partly explain 1 Thess. ii. 16 from the history of this period.

[4] Hitzig, in his acute treatise on John Mark (1843, p. 141), found in Matthew xxiv. 30 a convincing evidence of the employment of the Revelation (i. 7); Volkmar agrees

It is, however, certain that in Matthew's Gospel we stand on the very threshold of the fall of Jerusalem. The time is far spent, the Christians wait, the little band of apostles is welded together, the Lord, Christ (this official title repeatedly appears, as in Paul's writings, instead of the personal name), delays his coming.[1] The evangelist, as such, points to Daniel, the foreteller of the profanation of the temple, and to the Lord, who after a long series of preparatory stages is about to reward the patience of his Christians.[2] The so extraordinary, feverish, quivering expectation, revealed both by the detailed character and the elevated tone of these predictions, points to the actual dawn of the last times. The book (not its source merely) was written about A.D. 66, the year in which began that fatal war with Rome, the issue of which might be sketched in outline, but could only be surmised in detail; and contemporary with the war began also the emigration of Christians and Jews, the early commencement of which was not yet foreseen by the author.[3] Most modern critics refer the Gospel, or at least its earliest germ, to this time, or generally to the years 60—70, the date mentioned by the ancient Irenæus as that of the preaching of Peter and Paul in Rome (A.D. 64). Baur, however, has suggested—which is quite untenable—the years 130—134, the period of the second catastrophe at Jerusalem, under the Emperor Hadrian; Volkmar, the year 115, and more recently the years 105—110.[4]

Ecclesiastical tradition is also strongly in favour of the anti-

with him (*Der Ursprung u. Ev.* p. 158). But, apart from any other consideration, can such a conclusion be drawn from a single passage which was so completely the public property of the general apocalyptic literature of the Christians?

[1] Comp. Matt. xxiv. 48, xxv. 5, xvi. 28.

[2] Ibid. xxiv. 15, 32 sqq.

[3] Comp. Eus. 3, 5: *τοῦ λαοῦ τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας κατά τινα χρησμὸν δοθέντα πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου μεταναστῆναι τῆς πόλεως—κεκελευσμένου.*

[4] The passage in Irenæus, *Haer.* 3, 1, 1: Matthæus in Hebræis ipsorum lingua scripturam edidit evangelii, quum Petrus et Paulus Romæ evangelizarent et fundarent ecclesiam. Post vero horum excessum Marcus-Lucas, &c. Postea et Joannes discipulus domini et ipse edidit evangelium, Ephesi Asiæ commorans.

quity of this Gospel. As far back as we can go, the book of Matthew, with its companion the Gospel of the Hebrews, is the one most in use. Jewish Christianity, naturally archaic and conservative, rejected all other Gospels in favour of this; and the Judaizing Papias doubtless measured the imperfection, and even the want of arrangement, of Mark, by the standard of Matthew. The Gentile Christian writers also, with the author of the Epistle of Barnabas (about A.D. 120) at their head, gave Matthew the preference.[1] Thus is Matthew, almost without exception, placed first in the series of evangelists, and by the most ancient Fathers he is unanimously and expressly pointed out as the earliest evangelist.[2] Eusebius, going back beyond the date fixed by Irenæus, would place the origin of the book about the year 40. The earliest discoverable employment of the book is to be found in the other Gospels, and next, passing by Cerinthus the Gnostic (cir. A.D. 100—120), in the Epistles of Barnabas and Clement (cir. 120), in the Shepherd of Hermas (cir. 140), and in the writings of Justin (150).[3]

[1] Irenæus 1, 26, 2; Eus. 3, 27. In Barnabas, comp. only cap. 7, gall and vinegar; and cap. 4, many called, few chosen. Volkmar (*Ursprung*, p. 65), in opposition to Weizsäcker, admits the use of Matthew. I hold, however, in opposition to V., that the citation of the passage (Matt. xx. 16, xxii. 14) in cap. 4, introduced by ὡς γέγραπται, is not to be regarded as an instance of confounding Matthew with an Old Testament writing, such as the fourth book of Ezra, in which, moreover, the text is altogether different (multi creati, pauci salvabuntur), but as a pure quotation from the evangelical Scripture. The co-ordination of the New and Old Testaments (φωνὴ Θεοῦ δι' ἀποστ. κ. διὰ προφ.) did not begin, as Volkmar (p. 111 sqq.), following Credner, remarks, with Theophilus, A.D. 180, but earlier: comp. Justin, *Ap.* I. 61; *Tryph.* 119; Dionys. of Corinth (Eus. 4, 23); Tatian, cap. 13; *Epistle from Lyons*, in Eus. 5, 1. In the New Testament, 1 Tim. v. 18; 2 Peter iii. 16. Concerning the history of the elevation of the New Testament to the authoritative level of the Old Testament, comp. also 1 Clem. 1, 2, 13, 44, 46; Polycarp, *Phil.* 12; Valent. in *Philosoph.* 6, 34, τὸ γεγραμμένον ἐν τῇ γραφῇ = Eph. iii. 14 sq. 2 Clem. 2, ἑτέρα γραφὴ = Matt. ix. 13.

[2] Origen ap. Eus. 6, 25, πρῶτον γέγραπται. Iren. *Haer.* 3, 1, 1. Comp. Credner-Volkmar, *Gesch. des N. T. Kanon*, 1860, p. 393. In the *Cod. fragm. Ev. Marc. et Mt. antiquiss. ex mon. Bopp. Taurinum perlatus*, Mark stands once before Matthew.

[3] Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxx. 14) says, on the authority of Cerinthus himself, that the latter made use of this Gospel. It appears to me that the saying about the *Woe*, in 1 Clem. 46, resembles Matthew more closely than Luke.

Notwithstanding this Gospel's extreme, antique simplicity—seen, for example, in the fact of its being the only New Testament writing which retains the phrase used by Jesus himself, "the kingdom of heaven"—it is nevertheless by no means destitute of peculiarity of style and of art. We can detect in it a purpose, a plan, a method even in details, and a characteristic mode of expression. It is necessary to understand these points clearly, in order to know what degree of historical fidelity and what degree of originality, in comparison with other evangelists, we are to expect to find here.

In this singularly realistic Gospel, in which the author completely disappears behind his subject, there is, as Irenæus saw, one literary passion visible, namely, a longing to prove Jesus to be the true Messiah of Israel, a Messiah certainly unexpected in this form, yet exactly so announced by all the utterances of God in the Old Testament.[1] Whenever we find, "Here was fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah," or "All this came to pass that it might be fulfilled as it was written," the unseen author betrays himself and his purpose; and we are justified in looking for this purpose wherever the points of view are self-evident, though no Old Testament proof be appended. Thus the evangelist's aim is apologetic; he addresses himself, as Irenæus saw, to the Jews, but also, as Origen and his successors added, to the Jewish Christians, to whom it was necessary to reveal the glorious side of the life of Jesus, as well as to remove from that life what was offensive, by showing that, in fact, there existed predictions pointing in both directions, but most of all in the latter. It is therefore particularly set forth that God bore witness to him by signs of every kind, and that he was the Messiah in spite of the shadows in his history, in spite of the

[1] Iren. *Frag.* XXIX. ed. Stieren, I. p. 842, *τὸ κατὰ* M. *εὐ. πρὸς Ιουδαίους ἐγράφη. οὗτοι γὰρ ἐπεθύμουν πάνυ σφόδρα ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ Χριστόν. Ὁ δὲ* M. *καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον σφοδροτέραν ἔχωντὴν τοιάυτην ἐπιθυμίαν παντοίως ἔσπευδε*, &c. Therefore particularly the Davidic genealogy. Origen ap. Eus. 6, 25, *τοῖς ἀπὸ Ιουδαϊσμοῦ πιστεύσασι.*

laxity of his observance of the Law, in spite of his breach with the people—a breach which, in accordance with ancient prophecy, the people themselves brought about—and in spite of his death; the last clouds would be dispersed by his second advent, when he should come as the Saviour of Jerusalem, and should gather to himself all Israel, together with the believers who watched for him.[1] How far such apologetic history is historical, remains to be seen; meanwhile it appears in a favourable light, because it has not ignored the anti-Jewish thorn of offence in the life of Jesus.

The plan of the book is carefully digested, simple and luminous, transparently clear, and thoroughly well carried out. Without reckoning the narrative of the youth of Jesus, the author describes two great stages of his public life—his assumption of his public position in Galilee, with the call to repentance and with the preaching of the kingdom, and his entrance on the path of death with the passion-cry, and with the preaching respecting the future.[2] He has placed these main divisions before the reader with the greatest distinctness, and has divided each again into lesser sections. It was not merely to gratify an idle pleasure in making an ingenious and truly Jewish play upon numbers, that he clustered together ten miracles, eight beatitudes, seven woes, four and then three parables, three temptations, three followers, two blind men. In the first division he has admirably carried out the point of view of the twofold ministry of Jesus, to which he had drawn attention at the beginning: "He went about teaching, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom, and healing every sickness."[3] His first main divi-

[1] Köstlin (*Urspr. und Compos. der synopt. Ev.* 1853, pp. 6 sqq.) attempted to exhibit the Jewish aim of this Gospel more distinctly, yet he overlooked many things. It would be easy to show that the above-mentioned points of view are for the most part the outcome of an intentional reference to the Old Testament, Matt. xiii. 14, xv. 7, xxi. 42, xxvi. 54, xxvii. 34, 43.

[2] Matt. iv. 17, ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ιησοῦς κηρύσσειν καὶ λέγειν . . . . . Matt. xvi. 21, ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ι. δεικνύειν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. Even this striking parallelism has been persistently overlooked.

[3] Matt. iv. 23.

sion, in particular, thus breaks up into teaching and action; and, keeping due proportion both in great things and small, he allows the two subjects neither to be split into infinitesimal details, nor to swell into an exaggerated, wearying duality. He makes four stages, opening with great sayings and ending with great acts: Jesus' ministry begins with the Sermon on the Mount; the re-enforcement of his own ministry by the twelve apostles with his mission speech; the conflict opens with his parables; and its intenser stage with his polemic against the precepts of the Pharisees.[1] In the second main division, preaching and action give place to the dominant passion-cry, which is so expressed as to bring the fact of the passion nearer and nearer; hence there are four stages of the passion-cry—at Cæsarea, at Capernaum, before Jerusalem, and in Jerusalem before the Passover.[2] This advance of the history, co-existing with the arrangement of the sayings and actions in groups, shows that the author did not intend to sacrifice the historical onward movement of the life of Jesus to the classification of like things together. In fact, notwithstanding individual instances of anticipation or anachronism, we find on the whole a beautiful and continuous development of the history of Jesus. His preaching passes gradually from a kingdom that is approaching, to one that has come, and to one that is yet in the future; from a strong insistance upon the Law, to a freer and freer criticism of it; from a calling of all Israel, to a calling of babes and sucklings; from a calling of the Jews, to a calling of the Gentiles; from a preaching of the Messiah, to a preaching of the Son, and finally to a preaching of the cross. The proclamation, at Cæsarea Philippi, of the Messiah and of the passion is, in all respects, more brilliantly prepared for than in any other Gospel. In the acts of Jesus, the gradations of miracle are unmistakable in the first stage of the ten miracles after the Sermon on the

[1] (*a*) Ibid. v. 1, (*b*) x. 1, (*c*) xiii. 1, (*d*) xv. 1,

[2] (*a*) Ibid. xvi. 21, (*b*) xvii. 22, (*c*) xx. 17, (*d*) xxvi. 1, 2.

Mount, and then again in the third and the fourth stages, with the feeding of the thousands. His disciples develop gradually; from vague admiration they advance ultimately to the grand confession of Peter's. The conflict with the people and their leaders opens slowly: Jesus hopes, the people believe, the Pharisees bide their time, and Jesus acts with circumspection; but when he enters upon the second half of his career, there begins on both sides the struggle for life. Understood by his disciples, who make amends for the loss of sympathy without, misunderstood, hated, persecuted by the leaders of the people, he accepts his destiny in the name of God.

The presentation of details is everywhere natural and unostentatious; great facts speak for themselves, without the rhetoric either of artistic colouring or of astonished admiration. There is, nevertheless, discernible throughout an exquisite sensibility to the greatness of Jesus and the misery of the people. When we compare Matthew with his successors, whether in the case of one miracle or of all, we find truly in his book the simple grandeur of monumental writing, antique history, immeasurably effective because it is nature itself, because it does not aim at being effective.[1] This peculiarity is the more telling because the historian is not without art. He knows how to describe things in correct proportion, his sentences are smoothly rounded, and here and there a well-chosen Greek turn of expression is met with.[2] In the present day, scarcely any one holds the opinion of the ancient Church, that the work is derived from a Hebrew original: it is too decidedly Greek, most of the Old Testament quotations are from the Greek, not the Hebrew, Bible, and its Hebrew colouring is a characteristic it possesses in common with most of the writings in the New Testament, whose authors were of Jewish extraction.[3]

[1] Comp. Strauss, l.c. pp. 115 sq.

[2] Comp. Matt. vi. 16, xxi. 41.

[3] The mistaken belief was occasioned by Papias' mention of the Gospel of the Hebrews; see above, p. 41.

The general impression as to the historical character of the work is exceedingly favourable. It is true that the author, whoever he may have been, lived a full generation after Christ, when recollections had become indistinct, and mythical exaggerations and fresh interests had had time to grow up; but the interval had been too brief to sweep away an historical life altogether, the Jewish and Christian circles were too staid and too well taught to substitute dreams for facts, the Eastern memory was too tenacious, and eye-witnesses of the life of Jesus still lived. It is true that the author was a Jewish Christian, who attached some degree of importance to his Law and his nation; but the positive attitude of Jesus towards these things, as it is described by him, is thoroughly saturated with a liberalism that is not Judaistic, and the malicious sarcasms, said to have been directed against Paul, are mere fables.[1] It is true that the author is an apologist, and it may be that in his justification of Jesus by Old Testament quotations, or in his glowing anticipations, he has occasionally allowed himself to be carried too far; but his apology has, in the most important matters, disguised nothing, and his unadorned narrative flows out of a fount of veracity. It is true that the author is a systematist, and his grouping of facts and numbers favours the supposition that here and there a narrative or an expression has been removed from its original context; but, apart from his conscientiousness, the remarkable general coherence of his facts, and the psychological probability of all the greater onward movements of the history, save us from entertaining any serious suspicion. In short, he gives us a grand history, genuinely human in all its parts—in word and deed, in chronology and inner development. That this Gospel, though written by a Jewish Christian, should nevertheless in those leading points which are at once visible harmonize with Paul, and should exhibit a Christ elevated yet

[1] Assumed anti-Paulinism, Hilgenfeld, p. 114; also Strauss, pp. 112 sq. Hilgenfeld speaks of a standpoint of the anti-Pauline primitive community. At the same time, however, the critical attitude towards the Law is admitted, p. 115.

human, law-observing yet superior to the Law, Jewish yet more than Jewish, is to us a complete proof of its essential accuracy.

β.—*Internal Discrepancies.*

The grandly-designed and coherent arrangement of this work undoubtedly admits of its vindication as originally the composition of a single hand; in ancient times, however, and yet more at the present day, men have thought that certain differences of style—two or more distinct hands—are to be recognized in this Gospel. Formerly, and indeed from the second century, as Jerome shows, a distinction was made between author and translator; at present the translator has disappeared, yet under the two-fold stimulus of the enigmatical Gospel-problem—a problem the solution of which men have attempted to force out of this granitic, great, old, sealed book—as well as of the internal difficulties of the book itself, and the perplexing question of its relation to Luke and Mark, the author has been doubled, or at least the editor is believed to have been a distinct though very variously described person.[1] It cannot be a matter of indifference to the life of Jesus that in this book a distinction must be made between an earlier and a later authorship—it is possible that the earlier hand is the most correct, while the younger has collected later traditions or points of view.

None of the hitherto attempted analyses has obtained general recognition, and it is well that such is the case. From Schleiermacher down to Ewald, Köstlin, Holtzmann, and Weizsäcker, many critics have attempted to separate the sayings from the acts, and to establish the existence of a collection of sayings by Matthew, side by side with a history proper. On the other

[1] The original Hebrew, Pap. ap. Eus. 3, 39; Iren. 3, 1, 1; Origen, ap. Eus. 6, 25; Eus. 5, 8; Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 3: Primus in Judæa propter eos, qui ex circumcisione crediderant, ev. Christi hebraicis literis verbisque composuit; quod quis postea in græcum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Papias knew, indeed, of several translations. That the original was in Greek is now generally believed. Comp. Köstlin, pp. 37 sqq.

hand, the Tübingen school, represented by Baur, Schwegler, and Hilgenfeld, to whom also Köstlin, who belongs to both sides, is to be added, have endeavoured to set up a distinction between a strictly Jewish-Christian Gospel, and another, more liberal and friendly to the Gentiles, both containing speeches and acts, the former work being the original book, the latter interpolated, the whole being thus the product of two or three hands.

Schleiermacher's view is based upon the statement of the Chiliast Papias (middle of the second century) that Matthew had written "The Sayings," or oracles, in Hebrew.[1] The groups of sayings in the Gospel supported this view. Nothing was easier than to surmise that Matthew had given the collection of sayings without the acts, Mark simply the Gospel of the acts without the sayings, and our existing Matthew, as also Luke, a combination of the two. We shall have occasion to speak of Mark and Luke further on. But confining ourselves to the testimony of Papias and to Matthew, the ingenious supposition finds no support on either side. It is not by any means the intention of Papias to speak of a mere collection of sayings by Matthew; for what he, referring to its chief contents, calls "sayings," he has described, with reference to Mark, in one place briefly as "sayings," and in another, with greater exactness, as "sayings and acts." Whether there ever existed collections of the sayings only of Jesus is altogether doubtful (Luke i. 1). But there can be no doubt that in the time of Papias, our Matthew, with both sayings and acts, had long existed and was in very general use; hence nothing is more certain than that, glancing at our Matthew, he spoke of an original Matthew, and distinguished the former from the latter not as Gospel and collection of sayings, but simply as Greek translation and Hebrew original, as did Jerome later. Thus has Eusebius naturally understood him.[2] Next, as to Matthew himself. It is

[1] Eus. 3, 39. The *Logia*-oracles of God, Rom. iii. 2. See also Jos. *B. J.* 6, 5, 4.

[2] Eus. 3, 39: M. *μὲν οὖν ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτά ὡς ἠδύνατο ἕκαστος.* Previously of Mark: *τὰ ὑπό τοῦ* Χριστοῦ *ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα*

true that he has groups of sayings and acts which can be easily separated. Yet it is not so easy to assign distinct authors to each group. The construction of the group-arrangement in two lines, so characteristic of this Gospel, is rather suggestive of the mental activity of a single contriver—for example, the ten miracles after the Sermon on the Mount answer to the Sermon itself with its eight beatitudes, and its six and three attacks upon the Pharisees. Then the language is essentially one, even to the way and manner of quoting the Old Testament; there is one system of ideas, one chronology, one historical progression from the initial stages to the full development of the kingdom, from passive peace to war, from life to death. Notwithstanding isolated difficulties, the stamp of harmony is on the whole so perfect, that the composer must have been a prodigy to have been able to weave together in such a complete and masterly manner disconnected and mutually repugnant or indifferent materials—for the collection of sayings, especially, would have, as such and in itself, little regard to the historical development and progressive stages of the life of Jesus. We therefore decisively reject a theory the mechanical shallowness of which is fatal to the organic life of the Gospel, and which falls to pieces in the very hands of its inventors, since it must, after all, have been the evangelist, and not the collector of the sayings, who—freely enough it is true, nay, of necessity arbitrarily enough—decided as to the scope, relation, connection, and arrangement of the sayings.

This rude cleaving of the living body of the Gospel into two is certainly less acceptable than the attempt at division made by the Tübingen school, which seems rather to offer to the organism of the book a useful service than to threaten it, since it helps mutually repellent sets of ideas to a quiet and peaceful sepa-

—ἀλλ' οὐχ' ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων. I differ from Weizsäcker in thinking that, according to the context, the last word is used by no means of the sayings merely, but of the whole. Comp. besides the larger works, *Rud. Anger, Ratio, qua loci V. T. in ev. Mt. laudantur, quid valeat ad illustrandam hujus evangelii originem quæritur*, Parts I.—III. 1861, 1862, especially III. pp. 3 sqq.

ration. Is it not a fact that we ourselves have been astonished at the juxtaposition of the prohibition to preach to the Gentiles and the command to do so, of the adoring magi and the Messiah of the Jews, of the centurion of Capernaum and the woman of Canaan? We are told by the Tübingen school that there runs through the whole work the distinction of a stricter and a freer Jewish Christianity, and that we must—and Hilgenfeld says that we can—everywhere separate the stricter author from the more liberal interpolator. But this has never yet been so completely effected, even though the authors have been tabulated. However sharply and cruelly they have been separated, the tabulated authors, protesting against their dividers, have persisted in exhibiting the most friendly relations to each other.[1] In point of fact, even the writer of the earliest groundwork of the Gospel, the strict Jewish Christian shows himself, in his character of narrator of the Sermon on the Mount and of many other utterances and acts of Jesus, as rejoicing in the higher moral ordinances of Jesus, as superior to the trivialities of the Law, to the Sabbath and sacrifice, to fastings and washings, to regulations as to food and marriage, even to the Old Covenant altogether; he rises also superior to national prejudices, since he often represents the unbelieving nation as being peremptorily rejected, makes Tyre and Sidon, and Nineveh, and the Queen of Sheba, to be preferred to the Judaism of that day, and tells us that the woman of Canaan was praised as affording an example of strong Gentile faith—a faith that broke through the narrow principle of even Jesus himself. And the so-called interpolator speaks of the Sabbath as a day not to be profaned, of the holy places of the temple, of an embittered Gentile world, of privileges, of the conversion of Israel, and of Jerusalem, upon which, in the time of extremity, the Messiah shall arise to set up the kingdom of heaven. These facts show that the different points of view in the Gospel are logically incapable of supporting the

[1] Every one can find for himself examples in Hilgenfeld of this cruel separation. Comp. the removal of xxvi. 6—13, or of xxviii. 19, from the original work.

theory. If the innermost, most genuine, oldest kernel of the Gospel already exhibits these broad contrasts, it is impossible to make those contrasts our guide in a dissection of the Gospel, and this dissection becomes, moreover, an attack upon the living body of the Gospel.

There remains, nevertheless, an internal want of harmony in the Gospel, and however insignificant it may be in its extent and as to the principles involved, there remains the question how the discordant elements can be separated. The language affords one starting-point of inquiry. The investigations into the general linguistic relations of the Gospels have been by no means brought to a close even by the valuable researches of Gersdorf, Credner, Hitzig, Wilke, Zeller, and Holtzmann; but in one particular point an invariable distinction has been observed, from early times until now, and from Jerome downwards, through Bleek and Credner, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, and Anger, more and more exactly investigated, namely, the varying mode of quoting the Old Testament, sometimes from the Greek translation, sometimes in a new and independent translation from the Hebrew original.[1] The quotations of the former class preponderate, bearing the proportion to the second class of about thirty to ten; they are to be found throughout the whole extent of the Gospel, both in the sayings and the narratives, and even in the independent comments of the writer. On the other hand, there is a preponderance of passages of the second class in the author's independent reflections and in the quotations which he himself adduces. These facts are undeniable, but very various inferences are drawn from them. Some critics have preserved the unity of the writer, explaining the difference, with Bleek, as resulting from a peculiarity of the sources, or, with Credner and

[1] Comp. Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 3: Animadvertendum, quod ubicunque evangelista sive ex persona sua sive ex p. domini salvat. veteris scripturæ testimoniis abutitur, non sequatur LXX. translatorum auctoritatem, sed hebraicam. Of moderns, see especially Bleek, *Beiträge*, 1846, p. 57; Köstlin, pp. 37 sqq.; Holtzmann, pp. 258 sqq. Most especially Anger, l. c.

Anger, from the peculiarity of the writer himself. Others, following Ewald, have found in this characteristic a fresh confirmation of the distinction between the collection of sayings and the later Gospel, or, with Hilgenfeld, between an original Gospel and a later addition. It is true that many things seem to be in favour of the unity of the author in Anger's sense; for example, the preponderance of quotations from the Greek translation, the explicability of the use of direct translations from the Hebrew in the most striking Messianic passages, the peculiar admixture of both forms of translation in many instances, and, finally, the presence of both classes in all parts of the narrative, in both histories and sayings, as well as in the author's own subjective utterances. Nevertheless, this explanation does not suffice, true as it is that in Paul also, and elsewhere in the New Testament, a certain alternation of the same kind is to be found. Yet in these cases the alternation is not so persistent in both directions. There still remains a profound distinction, namely, that the quotations from the Greek largely preponderate in the objective narrative, those directly rendered out of the Hebrew Old Testament in the author's subjective comments; and this distinction is very imperfectly explained by mere, however subtle, variations of procedure on the part of one and the same author.[1] One cannot understand why a writer who preferred the Greek version for the whole of his historical narrative and for the sayings of Jesus, should not have found the same Greek version good enough for his own incidental remarks; nor why an admirer of the Hebrew should generally have had recourse to the Greek.[2]

[1] In all important sections of the history—besides the preliminary history—the Sept. prevails; comp. the temptation, the Baptist, the publican (ix.), the Sabbath controversy (xii.), the controversy with the Pharisees (xix.), the rich young man (ib.), the purification of the temple (xxi.), the children in the temple (ib.), the scribes (ib.), the Sadducees (xxii.). In the sayings of Jesus, only xi. 10 is from the Hebrew. In the author's pragmatism the Hebrew prevails: ii. 6, 15, 23, iv. 15, viii. 17, xii. 18, xxi. 5, xxvii. 9 sq. Sept. in i. 23, iii. 3.

[2] It is a noticeable fact that a number of significant Messianic passages are taken from the Sept.; for example, those referring to the birth by a virgin, Rachel, the preacher in the wilderness, the hope of the Gentiles, the callousness of Israel, the

It is altogether unintelligible why in some instances he adhered to the Greek text when the Hebrew had a different reading, and in other instances reverted again to the Hebrew, though the Greek was fully sufficient for his purpose.[1] If these phenomena are not to be altogether unexplained or ascribed to mere accident and arbitrary choice, we must assume the existence of two writers, one of whom preferred to use the Greek version, the other the Hebrew text, of the Old Testament. Certainly, Bleek errs in recognizing nothing more than a distinction between the author and his sources; otherwise, the whole book must consist of sources, and the sources must all have used the Greek version. Nor can we agree with Ewald in distinguishing between a collection of sayings and the Gospel itself, since a uniform employment of the Greek version prevails both in the sayings and the acts in the whole of the objective history; but with Hilgenfeld, in distinguishing between the original writing and its subsequent elaboration, only we cannot definitely trace the boundary-line between the two.

Were we to attempt to trace this boundary-line, we should, in the first place, be compelled to ascribe to the interpolator the explanations of the history of Jesus which are taken from the Hebrew Old Testament. The author of the Gospel would thus give the whole material, an interpolator would supply a relatively small number of short and, in his opinion, striking illustrations out of the old prophecies which were wonderfully fulfilled in Jesus. In this way the slight additions mentioned below may have arisen.[2] But in some places the interpolator's work is more extensive, as when the employment of the Hebrew Old Testament runs regularly through a whole section, and again where the historical narration is more or less dependent upon the Old

temple a house of prayer, the praise of babes and sucklings, the corner-stone, the Lord of David. The Sept. was indispensable for the birth by a virgin.

[1] Such as ii. 6, 18, iv. 15, xxi. 5. On the other hand, the Sept. would certainly not suffice for ii. 15, xxvi. 31, &c.

[2] iv. 14—16, viii. 17, xii. 17—21, xiii. 35, xxi. 4, 5.

Testament quotation. Thus, in the account of the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, at least the two animals on which he rode are introduced by the Old-Testament-quoting interpolator; Judas' thirty pieces of silver also, together with the context, are introduced by the translator of the passage from the prophets, which underlies the whole.[1] The most important instance is found in the preliminary history. With exception of the single passage as to the birth by a virgin, where, as often in other parts of the book, the Greek version was quite indispensable, the use of the Hebrew Old Testament prevails throughout the whole of the preliminary history, as can be demonstrated in four particulars; and these very particulars, the birth by the virgin—intimations of which are introduced also into the genealogy—the birth at Bethlehem, the flight into Egypt with the return thence, and the slaughter of the children at Bethlehem, are so much the more evidently the property of this collector of prophecies, as they find little or no confirmation elsewhere in the Gospel history.[2]

A further indication of different hands is to be found in the existence of several interpolations in the narrative, which betray the later aid of a second writer. Ewald, Köstlin, and Hilgenfeld, have enumerated a series of such additions. But one must accept only the most probable cases, for in the abundance of material and sources, the author himself, consistent and consecutive as his style in general is, might have fallen into an occasional carelessness in the introduction of certain passages. There is, for instance, no sort of connection between the history of the childhood of Jesus and that of his baptism; the latter is tacked on to the former in a strikingly loose and inexact manner, as if the childhood of Jesus and John's baptizing were contemporary; and to the baptism of Jesus is ascribed the inspiration from God which the narrative of the childhood expressly refers to his birth. This shows that the Gospel originally began with

[1] xxi. 2—7, xxvi. 15, xxvii. 3—10.

[2] From the Hebrew, ii. 6 (Bethlehem), 15 (Egypt), 23 (Nazarene); ii. 18 (Rachel) is a blending of the two.

the genealogy of Jesus (chap. i.) and John's baptizing (chap. iii.), and that the interpolator fitted in, as well as he could, the narrative of the childhood, a view which is confirmed by the language, as well as by the Gospel of the Ebionites.[1] The parable of the wedding-feast (xxii. 1—14) evidently interrupts the connection of the controversies at Jerusalem. The preceding parables had incited the Pharisees to attempt a forcible arrest of Jesus, but they were defeated by the people; now, according to xxii. 15, they substitute cunning for violence—here lies the connection which is disturbed by the parable of the wedding-feast; while the quiet delivery of the parable, after the open attempt at violence, is equally unintelligible both with regard to Jesus and to the Pharisees. The continuity of the section concerning the examination of the servants (xxiv. 45—51, xxv. 13—30) is altogether destroyed by the parable of the virgins (xxv. 1—12); and the day of judgment (xxv. 31—46) is at any rate very loosely attached to the preceding judgment of the servants. Finally, the account of the watch set at the grave (xxvii. 62—66) has forced itself between the burial and the resurrection of Jesus, as is very evident from its interference with the connection between the two evenings—Friday and Saturday—as well as from the different designation of the Saturday (xxvii. 57, 62, xxviii. 1). Several lesser textual disturbances are also sufficiently perceptible. The Baptist's refusal (iii. 14, 15) may be of later origin, since, according to the main narrative, the Baptist did not then know Jesus, and first received the divine intimation in the sign given at the baptism. The utterance in which the Jews are rejected in favour of the Gentiles, in the story of the centurion (viii. 11, 12), has nothing to call it forth in the general circumstances of the time, when the actually existing faith of Israel was the measure of the faith of the Gentiles; and the recognition of this interpolation silences many

[1] Notice iii. 1, in relation to what precedes it; and iii. 11, 16, in relation to i. 18, 20.

doubts. The petition of Pilate's wife (xxvii. 19) breaks in upon the proceedings of the tribunal, and betrays itself as an interpolation especially by its new view of the external situation, which, however, had been already given (ver. 18). The resurrections after the death of Jesus (xxvii. 52, 53) have been very unskilfully inserted by a second hand among a number of other signs which immediately followed the death of Jesus, while these resurrections did not take place until three days after, when they accompanied that of Jesus.

It is an important fact that the few passages of a later date, quoted above, are for the most part such as have given rise to doubt. This is the case at least with the most important portions—the preliminary history and the parable of the wedding-feast—in which, besides a want of harmony with the context, doubts are suggested in the former by the chronology, and in the latter by the language.[1] It would be easy also to collect other grounds of doubt, by way of addition or supplement to these. Thus it is significant that most of the rejected passages are altogether wanting in the Gospels that stand nearest in date to Matthew. Again, it is noteworthy that in our Matthew the passage concerning the Baptist's scruples stands at the beginning, while in the Gospel of the Ebionites it stands at the end of the narrative, an instability of position which criticism cannot regard as an evidence of authenticity. The quotations from the Hebrew Old Testament form a class by themselves, marked by the distinction that they are introduced by impressive stereotyped phrases, closely resembling each other, but not occurring

[1] Notwithstanding our previous remarks upon the passage, the parable of the royal wedding suggests doubts as to the chronology, since elsewhere in the Gospel the destruction of Jerusalem (including, certainly, the transfer of the kingdom to the Gentiles, comp. xxi. 41) is the *extreme horizon*, whilst here (xxii. 7, 8) it is the *starting-point* of large developments of the kingdom of God, which are described in detail. If this is an evidence of a post-apostolic date, then must the burning of Jerusalem (xxii. 7)—which, in xxiv. and also in xxiii. 37—39 (omit ἔρημος), is supposed to be still standing—be assigned, together with the whole section, in spite of the "armies of God," to the later writer.

either in the case of the sayings of Jesus, or of the reflections of the first writer.[1] The accounts of the betrayal by Judas and the watch set at the grave are allied, since these passages, which on other grounds also are suspected, are the only ones in the Gospel which refer to what was to their author the most recent date (xxvii. 8, xxviii. 15). Finally, a great number of the passages belonging to the interpolator show, when closely examined, a distinctly marked Gentile-favouring tendency, so that the views of the Tübingen school are at least partly and in a different way justified; for the story of the childhood with the Gentile magi, the declamation against the Jews, the parable and description of the judgment of the world, the Gentile men and the Gentile woman speaking on behalf of Jesus—all this and more besides is favourable to the Gentiles. In one of these passages (xxviii. 15) there even occurs the foreign-sounding name of "the Jews," which is found in the second, third, and fourth Gospels. After such evidences, who is prepared to deny that the work of the interpolator, or even, according to Papias, of the interpolators, of the book which was preferred to all others throughout the century (as Strauss also admits), extends still further?[2] But this supposition must be left until it can be proved; meanwhile, the impression is overwhelming that a grand unity underlies this Gospel, and that a moderate share of small but essentially related additions belongs to the Jewish-Christian interpolator, who lived after the destruction of Jerusalem, more or less contemporary with Luke or Mark, and who wrote in the spirit of a freer Christianity.[3]

[1] The sayings of Jesus are introduced by γέγραπται, ἀναπληροῦται, πῶς πληρωθῶσι (comp. iv. 4, xiii. 14, xxvi. 54); the author's reflections by οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ῥηθεὶς διὰ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφ. λέγοντος (iii. 3); the later writer's quotations always by variations of τοῦτο ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡ., comp. i. 22, ii. 15, iv. 14, viii. 17, xii. 17, xiii. 35, xxi. 4, xxvii. 9. Other formulæ, ii. 5, 18.

[2] Strauss, l. c. p. 118.

[3] Luke and Mark have made no perceptible use of the additions of the later hand, and consequently do not concern themselves with him, either positively or negatively, as the several passages show, *e. g.* the narrative of the childhood in Luke, or the

γ.—*Degree of Credibility.*

We must, however, make a distinction between author and interpolator. In the first place, we will give the author—the real proprietor of a Gospel which in the main is a connected and organic whole—credit for all those excellences which can be detected at once. It is very easy to show, first, that the Gospel is in essential harmony with the facts of the Jewish history of that period, as we learn them especially from Josephus. The distress and earnest longing of Israel and Galilee under Herod and the earliest governors, the power of the hierarchy after all its modifications, the principles and actions of parties, unfolded in the Gospel more fully than anywhere else, are all established by history; while the characteristic features which are given of Herod Antipas, of the procurator, of the Sadducean high-priests, and of John the Baptist, are completely in harmony with history, and the general account of the Baptist is confirmed by Josephus. Secondly, when we refer to the oldest Christian sources, we find that Paul in particular confirms the representations of this Gospel, both in general and in detail; and as to the details, he has given an almost literally identical account of the Davidic descent of Jesus, his human birth, his Jewish attitude, his doctrinal teaching, his teaching to the Apostles, his teaching as to the future, his institution of the last supper, the raillery addressed to him as he was dying, his burial and his resurrection. The later Gospels also, especially Mark and Luke, endorse the most important narratives, and, despite their more advanced standpoint, do not fail to give clear evidence of the legalistic and national standpoint of Jesus,—a standpoint which an unhistorical school of historians, including Strauss in part, have attempted to repre-

miracles after the death of Jesus in both. It is possible that the freer handling of the Gospel history by Luke and Mark gave occasion to the improvement of the generally recognized Gospel, and this again led to the separation of the strictly Jewish Gospel of the Hebrews.

sent as simply the limited Jewish-Galilean one of the author.[1] Thirdly, the history of Jesus bears throughout the appearance of probability; that is, the events are so described as they could have been historically and psychologically expected to have taken place in the midst of the given relations and under the influence which a new creative genius would exert upon his age. Thus Jesus is represented as a reformer of Judaism, but also as driven by the current of events beyond the limits of Judaism; he is an upholder and quickener of the most exalted ideas of his nation, a divinely-prepared personality, that wrestles and struggles, that inwardly perfects itself, but outwardly perishes with a loud cry of anguish. The sayings of Jesus, in particular, besides possessing the characteristics of their age, exhibit all the evidences of an exalted and strongly-marked originality, of a powerful nature, of a divine enthusiasm and energy: so completely is this the case, that every sentence is full of an antique character soon lost in the Church, and bears a peculiar mental stamp which no successor, no evangelist, Jew or Gentile, not even Paul himself, could have invented.

With all this, it must be admitted that not every letter is a word of his, not every narrative a history of him. In spite of the general preservation of the correct sequence of events, the exact chronology of the lesser details has been lost, both in the sayings and in the narratives, as the very arrangement of sayings and deeds in separate groups indicates. Facts which lay apart are artificially brought together, single incidents—at least during the first half of the Galilean ministry of Jesus—are given either too early or too late, some are doubled, while others are separated from their connection and thus deprived of their right meaning. Many traces of this disturbed chronology will be seen on comparing this Gospel with the others; and though the different arrangement in the other Gospels is no proof of superiority, it is

[1] Comp. only Luke xvi. 17, standing so isolated in this place, and with its force beforehand diminished by ver. 16; or Mark vii. 27, with its elaborately unsuccessful softening of the Jewish particularism of Jesus.

nevertheless, at least to some extent, an evidence of varying traditions. Such a comparison proves nothing more certainly than that the first Gospel itself rests in part upon several different written sources, the existence of which it very evidently betrays by its double narratives, but which it has arranged in a different manner from the other Gospels.[1] Perilous as it is to attempt to enumerate these sources, and prone as such enumerations, which from time to time have been with difficulty arrived it, are to dissolve into air—since we cannot define, either in Matthew the boundary between the sources and the author, or in Mark and Luke that between the old and the new sources, including Matthew as one of the sources, and the author's additions—yet it may be stated that the parallel passages in Luke seem to point to an earlier source, which, though perhaps not more purely preserved, was nevertheless marked by a more painstaking, severer style of composition, and compared with which the composition in Matthew is perhaps here and there of a later date.[2] Upon one subject the sayings in Matthew, and indeed in the other Gospels, may have undergone an essentially disturbing modification, not only as to their composition, but also as to their meaning, viz. the revelations of the future. So much is here put into the mouth of Jesus that really belongs to the period when his believers, especially those who came out of Israel, were waiting, longing, and reckoning the days—so much that formed the ground of consolation to the expectant Christians of a later time; in any case, the definite predictions of the destruction of Jerusalem, and of the immediately following return of Jesus, are wrecked not only upon the rock of non-fulfilment, but also by that utterance of his which is in appearance so quiet, but in fact so critical an accompaniment to the predictions, viz. that the day and the hour are in the hands of God.[3]

The narratives in the Gospel are perhaps encumbered by yet more difficulties. We should not, indeed, be justified in unhesi-

[1] Comp. Strauss, l. c. p. 116.

[2] See below, concerning Luke.

[3] xxiv. 36.

tatingly attacking the miraculous in the history of Jesus, and in attempting to banish it from the history as mythical, perhaps as analogous to the miraculous legends of the Old Testament (Strauss). This were to pronounce sentence before the trial, to prejudge the matter from the sentiments of our own age instead of giving an historical verdict; to do this is forbidden by the real greatness of Jesus, a greatness transcending the type of his own and of all ages; it is forbidden also by the impossibility of fixing the boundary-line between soul and body, mind and nature, God and creation; and, finally, it is forbidden by the facts of the case, and by the belief of the apostolic as well as of the Pauline age. This Gospel is distinguished also by a certain moderation, more particularly in the description of the miracles. Nevertheless, here and there legends have crept in. By the manner in which the miracles and signs are here related, we are reminded of the fact that Jesus, and afterwards, in the name of Christianity, Paul, rejected signs; that, according to authentic utterances of Jesus and reliable narratives, the life of Jesus was one of privation and want, and not of dominion over all the ordinances of earth; that, finally, other accounts (as those of the Acts of the Apostles) have limited the miracles of the Lord to works of healing,—which also form the majority of the miracles mentioned in this book.[1] Several passages cancel themselves, or are cancelled by other and accredited accounts in this or some other Gospel, as will be shown in the proper place.[2] But it notwithstanding happens—an evidence of the substantial truthfulness of the work—that real and important historical facts underlie all the more glorifying features of the history, e.g. in the baptism of Jesus, and in the temptation. Thus the glorification of Peter, which in the other Gospels passes, for obvious reasons, out of sight, may have had its origin chiefly in his actual historical pre-

[1] Comp. Matt. viii. 20; Acts x. 38.

[2] Thus Matt. xii. 40 is cancelled by xvi. 4 and Luke xi. 29, 30; Matt. xxi. 19 sqq. by Luke xiii. 6 sqq. The second miracle of feeding is self-evidently, as well as by comparison with Luke, a duplicate and a legendary variation.

cedence. A further misgiving as to this Gospel is occasioned by its apologetic tendencies, which are, however, to be found in the original work. We may ask whether the Messianic references consist only of isolated innocent marginal glosses added to a history, the first impression of which is that of fidelity to tradition and of artlessness, or whether they have not coloured the history itself to its very core? We recall the Davidic descent of Jesus, the appearance of John as Elias before the Messiah, the Sermon on the Mount as a copy of Sinai, the mount of transfiguration where Moses and Elias appear, the entry into Jerusalem with royal solemnity, the perpetually recurring references to suffering which could make the inconceivable death of the Messiah endurable as a death of free choice and predetermination; finally, the gall that was given him to drink and the mockery of the crucified one, in which the Old Testament is said to have been fulfilled. Is all this, and more, only Jewish ideas, or is it history? Fortunately, for the far greater number of these facts—with exception, perhaps, of the mount of transfiguration and the gall—we can adduce grave historical evidence, and thus far confirm the first impression of this Gospel's essential fidelity to tradition.

The author was certainly not an Apostle, as the ancient Church (since Papias and Irenæus) universally assumed, and as many of our own time admit, at least with reference to the collection of sayings or the original writing; he was not even an eye-and-ear witness. That he was not an Apostle may be gathered generally from the objective manner in which the author speaks of Apostles, as well as from his Hellenistic characteristics, his writing in Greek, his use of the Greek version of the Old Testament, his apparent dependence upon previous authors, and, finally and chiefly, from his fusion of the details of the history into a series of groups, and from the readiness with which he accepted so many mythical traditions. That he was not the Apostle Matthew in particular, may be gathered—quite apart from the descriptions given of the latter by the later Church—from the desig-

nation of his person, "a man named Matthew" (ix. 9), and from the complete absence of any apparent influence upon the writer's narrative exercised by the fact that he must have been an eye-witness from the time of his attaching himself to Jesus: on the contrary, his most minute descriptions are those of events of which he was not a witness, and the mixing together of independent incidents into groups is continued after his becoming a disciple.[1] It is significant that Luke, presumably the earliest writer who possessed a critical acquaintance with the Gospel, knew nothing—to judge from his preface—of one written directly by an Apostle, or of a Matthew-Gospel. Undoubtedly there is something imposing in the ascription of this book to the Apostle Matthew by the Church of the second century, both on account of its unanimity, and also of the inexplicability of the choice of the name of this Apostle, who in the circle of the Apostles and in the book itself retires so far into the background. It would have been much more intelligible if the book had been named after Peter, who plays in it the chief part, and who also has sometimes been regarded as the author of the Hebrew Gospel. We may surmise that the book acquired the name of Matthew less from the belief that a publican would possess a special aptitude for writing, as Bleek and Strauss suggest, than from the fact, peculiar to this Gospel, that he receives the two-fold designation of "Matthew, the publican," and from the prominence given to the intercourse between Jews and the publicans and to the parables based on monetary relations,—features which seem peculiarly appropriate to the publican-Apostle.[2]

The admission that the book was not directly of apostolic origin, does not in itself prevent us from ascribing to it the

[1] Clem. Alex., *Paed.* 2, 1, mentions his ascetico-Essenic life: M. *μὲν οὖν ὁ ἀπόστολος σπερμάτων καὶ ἀκροδρύων καὶ λαχάνων ἄνευ κρέων μεταλάμβανε.* This account does not agree exactly with the Gospel (comp. ix. 10, 14), but who knows whether it be historical?

[2] That the title *εὐ. κατὰ* M. indicates nothing but authorship is shown by all the earliest documents, in opposition to Faustus Manich., Credner, and Volkmar. Also *καθ' Ἑβραίους* = auctoribus Hebræis. Comp. Bleek, *Einl.* p. 87; Hilgenfeld, *Kanon*, p. 69.

credibility possessed by an author holding a position midway between that of an eye-witness and that of a narrator of long-past events. The chronological and local evidences of a Hellenistic-Jewish author standing in close proximity to the temple, and the manifold indications of fidelity to fact, equally justify us in seeking him in the soil most favourable to the task of writing a life of Jesus, namely, in a Palestinian and probably Jerusalemitic community, shortly before their migration across the Jordan to their place of refuge at Pella.[1] Not only the utterances respecting the future, but more particularly the intermediate position between subjection to the Law and freedom from it, love to the nation and a breach with it, point to a community that, on account of the indications of divine wrath and the growth of error and disorder among the people, were painfully separating themselves from the holy city devoted to destruction. And thus, on the one hand, there was remoteness from the life of the Lord, and the living amid fading reminiscences of details and animated colloquial second-hand narrations, old impressions and new feelings and wants; but, on the other hand, there was also contact with so many still surviving depositaries of the great history in the persons of the brethren of Jerusalem, perhaps also of the Apostles; there was the peculiar, genuinely Oriental tenacity of memory, as well as the use of existing, earlier memoranda; such a combination of circumstances brought into existence the Gospel as we now possess it—a Gospel of the most remarkable two-fold character, with its fidelity in some places dazzlingly pure and in others tarnished. There is nothing to prevent any one from supposing that the author possibly came into contact with the Apostle Matthew. Nothing certain is known concerning the residence of the Apostles in Jerusalem after the apostolic council

[1] Even Köstlin (also Strauss, l. c. p. 118) regards the author as a "Galilean Jewish Christian" (pp. 33—35); he pays less attention to ch. xxiv. than to the notices concerning the Galilean *epigonoi* given centuries later by Jul. Africanus and Jerome. That the opinion of Delitzsch (also of Köstlin), that the book originated in Peræa, is untenable, is shown by the exegesis of xix. 1. And where can we find any remains of a Galilean eschatology?

(cir. A.D. 53), and absolutely nothing after Paul's arrest in Jerusalem (A.D. 59). The author's reliance upon Matthew would have given him only the same degree of certitude as it was possible to acquire by intercourse with other eye-witnesses, perhaps the brothers of Jesus among others.

The additions of the interpolator stand a degree lower in the scale of evidence and worth. Indeed, it may be unequivocally asserted that he has scrupulously confined himself to building upon the fundamental statements and convictions of the Gospel. His proofs out of the Old Testament, his Gentile-favouring tendencies, were already anticipated by those of the Evangelist. His efforts to point out the sublimity and splendour of this life, also connect themselves very naturally with the work of his predecessor. Thus his novelties are only in part confirmations of the old points of view, and in part additional sayings and narratives which also readily subordinate themselves to those points of view. The additional quotations from the Old Testament in support of the settlement of the parents of Jesus in Galilee, of the entry into Jerusalem, of the vocation of Jesus as the Saviour of the Gentiles, and also of the ideal human character of his Messiahship, cannot be found fault with. But the fresh sayings and narratives are for the most part taken from the then existing tradition, and in a few instances are embellishments of the writer's own, as may have been the case in the introduction of two animals into the narrative of the entry into Jerusalem, on the strength of the Old Testament passage. These traditionary narratives and sayings, however, exhibit a two-fold character. Many can be welcomed as valuable gleanings from the life of Jesus; among which are to be reckoned isolated utterances and parables, notwithstanding the deductions which have to be made for the modifications due to an advanced Pauline age.[1] Among

[1] Thus the parable, xxii. 1 (comp. Luke xiv. 16 sqq.), or the description of the last judgment, xxv. 31 sqq., may be founded on a saying of Jesus. In any case, in the description of the last judgment, the rewarding of the Gentiles, not so much for their Christianity as for their beneficence to the Christians, the kernel of the world and the favourites of God, is very ancient (reminding us especially of x. 42).

the narratives, that of the intercession of the procurator's wife for Jesus, while it is at once a new evidence of sympathy with the Gentiles, is at any rate not obnoxious to objection. Others, and among them the most important, rest upon a traditional basis of which strict history can make no use whatever. This traditional character is betrayed by the silence of the earlier as well as of the later Gospels, by the contradiction of historical facts, by forced fulfilments of Old Testament passages,—fulfilments existing in the imagination not only of the writer himself, but of the whole of the later Jewish-Christian community. This, however, is not the place to adduce proof of these particulars: that proof is given in the following history. The longing was early excited —a longing which found the fullest satisfaction in the Apocryphal Gospels—for exacter information as to the birth and childhood of Jesus, and thereby at the same time to obtain an explanation of his miraculous life. Hence arose, out of the Old Testament, the belief that he was born of a pure virgin, the belief in the adoration of the magi, the flight into Egypt, and the recall thence,—stories which also pointed out the way of Christianity to the Gentiles. Glorification at the beginning, glorification at the end; to the miracles accompanying the death of Jesus was added the resurrection of the pious of Israel, the earnest of the general resurrection in the kingdom of the Messiah,—an anticipated resurrection also based on the Old Testament. At the same time, stumbling-blocks were removed from the history: thus, the reproach that Jesus had been baptized as a repentant sinner was removed by John's refusal to baptize him; the reproach of the base betrayal, by the fact that the Scriptures had foretold it all—from the thirty pieces of silver to the field of blood; the reproach of the theft of the body of Jesus, by the assertion that a military watch had guarded the grave, had witnessed the resurrection, but were bribed to deny it.

It is, at any rate, a noteworthy fact that the evangelical reminiscences become confused as soon as we take a single step downwards from the first Gospel.

(B.)—Luke.

a.— *Time and Place.*

The Evangelist whom we are accustomed to reckon as the third, was still further removed from the events of which he wrote. Even without the aid of the Acts of the Apostles, the second part of this historical work, it is easy to discover that the Gospel was written after, long after, the destruction of Jerusalem.[1] Otherwise than in the case of Matthew, the actual catastrophe of the holy city stands before the soul of this writer in all its terrible extent—the tedious and skilful siege by the enemy, the armies, the fortified camp, the circle of blockade, the thousand distresses, the bloody work of the sword, the leading of the people into captivity, the temple and the city laid even with the ground—everything is seen under the strong conviction that it was a divine judgment for the murder of him that was sent. Nay, beyond this catastrophe, which is the extreme perspective of the first Evangelist, there spreads out before the view of the new historian a fresh and indefinitely protracted period, during which Jerusalem lies in ruins under the iron heel of the Gentiles, and of the Gentile times in the midst of which the historian writes.[2] Under such circumstances, the great discourse of Jesus concerning the future suffered manifold alterations, notwithstanding all the care taken to preserve its essential features, even to that of his return in "this generation." The disciples do not inquire about the end of the world, now projected so far into the future; only about the fall of the temple.[3] The end will not draw nigh, nor will sun and moon lose their light, "immediately" after that fall and its accompanying sorrow; the disciples themselves will not look upon the end, but only the

[1] In the Acts, viii. 26 points, according to its only probable explanation, to the destruction of Gaza by the Jews in the beginning of the Jewish war, *B. J.* 2, 18, 1.

[2] Luke xix. 43, 44, xxi. 20—24, also xvii. 22 sqq. [3] xxi. 7.

beginning of the end.[1] All the other predictions have also undergone a modification. The disciples will not see the coming of the Son of Man, only that of the kingdom of God; nor will the Sanhedrim see the reappearance of Jesus; they will only witness his sitting at the right hand of God.[2] Men are earnestly warned not to deceive themselves by thinking that the kingdom of God is at hand. Only the kingdom of God, without the Lord of the kingdom, is at hand; still this kingdom gives to the disciples such views of the future as allow them to hope that when their own ministry is closed, their successors—a Paul and his assistants—shall achieve a bold, and unarrested, and unparalleled harvest of the world.[3] A copious Gospel literature, mentioned by the author, is only another evidence of the advanced position of Christianity, both as to fact and time.[4] From all this, we conclude that the Gospel was written considerably after the year 70, in the Gentile era of Christianity, but not later than the time of the victorious campaign of the post-apostolic Gentile-Christian Church; at any rate, before the time of Trajan—since the book is full of faith in an unarrested spread of Christianity—and before the Gospels of Mark and John, i. e. about A.D. 90. The ancients also held the book to be later than Matthew, and made a less frequent as well as a later use of it; moderns have generally placed the date of its composition between the years 70—100.[5]

[1] xxi. 25, 28.

[2] ix. 27, comp. Matt. xvi. 28; Luke xxii. 69, comp. Matt. xxvi. 64.

[3] Luke xix. 11 sqq., xvii. 22, xviii. 1, ix. 27, xviii. 29, 30 (comp. Matt. xix. 29), xii. 3 (comp. Matt. x. 27), x. 1, 2.

[4] i. 1—3.

[5] Comp. Iren. as to its date, 3, 1, 1: Post vero horum excessum (death of Peter and Paul), wrote Mark and (about the same time) Luke. In 3, 9, and 10, the order is Matthew, Luke, Mark. According to Clem. Alex. ap. Eus. 6, 14, Luke was written *before* Mark; the Gospels with genealogies are the oldest. This is contrary to Credner-Volkmar, *Kanon*, p. 384. The use of Luke is first visible in Justin and Clem. Homilies (comp. 9, 22; 19, 2); in Barnabas, 1 Clement, and the Shepherd, its use cannot be shown. Papias (Eus. 3, 39) does not mention Luke. Irenæus assumes the use of the Gospel by the Ebionites, although they rejected Paul, *Hær.* 3, 15, 1.

The Gospel was evidently written at a distance, not only of time, but also of locality, from the theatre of the sacred life. In the first place, "the Jews," their language and their customs, and even the disputations of Jesus concerning the Law, are unfamiliar to its author, a fact which is explicable from his position as a Gentile Christian. But the author has not even mastered the geography of the Holy Land. His description of the journey of Jesus to Jerusalem is grossly inaccurate: ignorant of the territorial boundaries, he finds it possible for Jesus to have spent an incredibly long time travelling between Samaria and Galilee, and he naively speaks of the little town of Nain in Galilee as a city of Judæa.[1] In recent times, no one has doubted that this work was composed at a distance from Palestine; and when one takes into consideration its connection with the Acts of the Apostles and with the Gospel of Mark, the evidence is found to be in favour of a Roman origin.

β.—Sources.

These facts by no means prevent its taking a place as a valuable contribution to history. If the Evangelist had at his disposal a number of earlier sources which are not now extant, if he worked up his material carefully and to some extent critically, he was yet in a position to compete with the earlier Matthew. In point of fact, the preface of the book excites our confidence. It shows that he made use of many previous works, though of no directly apostolic "histories;" that, as Origen observed, he was not altogether satisfied with the "attempts" of previous writers; and that he was conscious of the difficulties of his undertaking. He therefore engages to make a new attempt, if without any really fresh sources, yet with a thorough revision of the existing material, since it is his purpose to narrate the

[1] ix. 52 sqq., xvii. 11, vii. 11, 17.

whole of the Gospel history from the beginning, in chronological order, with accuracy of detail.[1]

The sources used by him are to some extent recognizable both in the Gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles. This shows that, notwithstanding his own skill as an author, he nevertheless very readily contented himself with the existing accounts, so far as they were trustworthy, even when they did not fully satisfy his taste, nor perhaps even his dogmatic opinions. It can hardly be denied that it was precisely owing to his sources that his Gospel lacks in many respects the finish which he succeeded in giving to the Acts of the Apostles. Our business here is merely to point out the most evident of his sources.

As the preface intimates, his chief sources belong to the province of Jewish Christianity. Köstlin has correctly observed this. The author has shown special preference for a writing, among the Jewish peculiarities of which—besides a pious regard for the holy city, for a life subject to the Law, for a Davidic Messiahship—were the glorification of poverty, and a stern antipathy to the world and the princes of the world. This Ebionitic document, by no means a mere collection of sayings, as modern critics believe, extends evidently throughout the whole Gospel, in narratives and sayings, from the preliminary history till the Jerusalemitic catastrophe, a great and complete Ebionitic Gospel. It can generally be clearly distinguished from the work of the author himself, by its uniform fundamental principles and its antique and Jewish character. As early as in the preliminary history, the poor are placed in a favourable

[1] i. 1—4. Comp. Origen, *Hom. in Luc.* i: Hoc, quod ait, *conati* sunt, latentem habet accusationem eorum, qui absque gratia spir. s. ad scribenda evangelia prosiluerunt. Matthæus quippe et Marcus et Joannes et Lucas *non sunt conati* scribere, sed spiritu s. pleni scripserunt evangelia. How eagerly the Church strove to find reliable witnesses in the disciples of the Apostles is well known from the writings of Papias, Irenæus, and Tertullian; but note the introduction of Luke by Jerome. Luke is (*Vir. ill.* 7) not only the individuus comes omnis peregrinationis Pauli (comp. Ir. 3, 14, 1), but has also learnt a ceteris apostolis, and asserts this explicitly in his preface.

contrast with the rich, and the poverty of the Holy Family is exhibited, as in the later history the poverty of Jesus. The Sermon on the Mount is a manifesto on behalf of those who are poor in material goods, while the later sayings and parables extol poverty, and with the utmost severity require men to give away all their goods.[1] The parables of the unjust steward, of the bidding of the poor into the kingdom of God, of Lazarus and the man clothed in purple, the stories of Zaccheus, of the poor widow, of the division of the inheritance, and of the rich husbandman, inculcate the same principle.[2] The contrast between riches and poverty is as that between unrighteousness and righteousness, darkness and light, present and future, the devil and God.[3] The devil is the firmly-established prince of this world; he tempts Jesus in the desert through a forty days' campaign, and again and again renews his attacks till the death of Jesus; he rages against him in the persons of many who are possessed, enters into Judas and threatens the rest of the Twelve, especially Peter, so that the prayers of Jesus hardly save them from falling; and after the departure of the Lord, the widowed Church cries to heaven, Save me from the adversary![4] These are the most obvious traces of this Gospel source. It was not wanting in a legalistic spirit in a narrower sense, but it seems that Luke cared less for the parts in which that was exhibited. It is at least evident that the preliminary history approvingly exhibited the subjection of the holy families to the Law; and that Luke has intentionally omitted from the Sermon on the Mount those sayings of Jesus that refer to the Law, while, however, he occasionally allows similar sayings to stand, as in the introduction and close of the parable of Lazarus.[5]

[1] i. 52, ii. 7, 24, viii. 1 sqq., vi. 20 sqq., xi. 41, xii. 33.

[2] xvi. 1 sqq., 19 sqq., xii. 13 sqq., xiv. 12 sqq., xviii. 1 sqq., xix. 1 sqq., xxi. 1 sqq.

[3] Comp. only xvi. 1 sqq. [4] iv. 1—13, 33 sqq., x. 18, xxii. 3, 28, 31, xviii. 3.

[5] The ἀλλὰ of the Sermon on the Mount, vi. 27, is remarkable: does it not refer to a previous anti-Pharisaic utterance, which appears to have been struck out? Comp. Matt.: ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν. See also Luke xvi. 16 sqq.

This Gospel source offers a remarkable parallel to Matthew. In sayings and narratives the two sometimes agree even to the letter. This has given occasion to different kinds of surmises. Luke has simply made use of Matthew, or Matthew of Luke; or, if not, both have made use of a common source, a collection of sayings, or, still better, a Gospel, Matthew having, according to some, Luke, according to others, more faithfully adhered to the original source. In truth, the latter is the only question open; the simple employment of one Gospel by the author of the other —a view last defended by Baur—is contradicted by a too great difference between the texts, and especially by the fact that the Pauline Luke would certainly not have made the sayings from Matthew more Jewish than they already were, which, if the view be correct, he has however done. But it is evident that Luke's source is later than our Matthew, as Weizsäcker also has observed, in opposition to Bleek and Holtzmann, who would find in Luke the original form of the collection of sayings. Luke's source was probably a composition consisting in the main of old and new materials, with passages from Matthew, if it was not exactly one of the many Ebionitic versions of our Matthew. It contained a mass of new, and in many cases later material, in which were sayings and narratives in fresh and often quaint connection, with circumlocutions, toning down of peculiarities, and fantastic conceits, as may be seen in the arrangement of the Sermon on the Mount and of the sermon to the Pharisees; above all, in the place of the healthy, theocratic, moral tone of Matthew, there is the new, morbid, distorted genius of Ebionitism and dualism.[1] That there are men who consider the sayings in Luke to be, on the whole, of earlier date than those in Matthew, is an evidence that Gospel criticism is still in its infancy. An apparent corroboration of such a view

[1] vi. 20 sqq., xi. 37 sqq. The Sermon on the Mount shows dependence upon Matthew. Among its grave offences, besides its undisguised Ebionitism, I reckon its partiality for the comparison of God and pious men to earthly sinners: comp. xvi. 1 sqq., xviii. 1 sqq.

has been found in the looser, more aphoristic form of many of the sayings in Luke, a difference supposed to be favourable to the assumption that Matthew and Luke made use of two branches of one and the same source, and that Matthew, or his copy of the source, has better preserved the original spirit, Luke the original form; but upon closer examination, this opinion is seen to be untenable in such a comprehensive shape, since the form of Luke's arrangement is, even in the source itself, anything but original, and is partly, as will be shown, the product of his own decentralizing labour.[1]

Besides this Ebionite edition of Matthew, Luke had access also, as Strauss has observed, to our Matthew in its older form, the Matthew without the preliminary history and the interpolations. He was not content with the possession of a source which closely resembled Matthew, even though he preferred to guard his independence of Matthew by the use of this source. Thus, though by a circuitous route, the view of Griesbach and Baur is substantiated. The later date of the third Gospel and its acknowledgment of a use of a number of sources make their view possible; the construction of the third Gospel justifies that view. We will not weary our readers with a multitude of detailed proofs, but will lay our finger merely upon the general plan. The excellent arrangement of the evangelical history,—the two great periods of the preaching of the kingdom and the preaching of the passion, each period with its four stations,—this is the peculiar property of Matthew. The written sources of Luke, and particularly the Ebionite work derived from Matthew, cannot have possessed this exact arrangement, since that arrangement had been disturbed by a mass of more loosely-connected interpretations, a telling proof of which is afforded by ch. x.—xviii. of Luke. Now it is a very remarkable fact that Luke's arrangement is satisfactory so long as he is in some way in contact with

[1] Comp. Weizsäcker, p. 139. The above does not exclude the belief that in many cases Luke, or rather his source, is the older and more original. But it is not the Ebionite source which exhibits this older character, but the *concealed source of this source*.

Matthew; and again, from the point where he returns from the labyrinth of the interpolation to Matthew's narratives. In particular, he has the two chief periods, though in a somewhat altered form, since to him Jesus is the prototype of the Apostle Paul, the itinerant missionary, a character which Matthew had already in some degree depicted; the two periods therefore are those of the journey of the kingdom and the journey of the passion.[1] It is a consequence of Luke's point of view that the second great period begins somewhat later; not at Cæsarea Philippi, but with the setting out from Galilee towards Jerusalem.[2] Luke's dependence upon the fundamental division of Matthew is all the more evident from the fact that he has in no way whatever prepared the reader for the sublime crisis, the resolve to suffer, the road to the passion; the brilliantly successful introduction of Matthew, Jesus' struggles and retreats, are either wanting or have unfortunately been already used up.[3] The several stations of Matthew's first great period are preserved, but are somewhat differently arranged, to suit Luke's requirements: the stations of the inaugural sermon, of the Sermon on the Mount, of the parables, of the mission of the Apostles, evidently form the skeleton of the organism, around which the whole of the flesh of the narrative is arranged.[4] In lesser details, the grouping of subjects chiefly in a four-fold arrangement, is an evident imitation.[5] The stations of the second great period also have a visible relation to those of Matthew, and even the whole of the refractory material of interpolated narratives and sayings is forcibly arranged under the various dominating

[1] Comp. in the first division of Luke, iv. 14 sqq., 43; more particularly viii. 1 (before the parables). This passage commends itself for comparison with Matt. iv. 23 sqq.; ix. 35 sqq., passages which have recently been ascribed to the interpolator.

[2] ix. 51. Baur has already perceived this.

[3] A slight examination of the section that precedes ix. 51 must make this plain to every one. At the *very beginning*, the conflict is one of life or death, iv. 29 sq., vi. 11.

[4] The displacement of the mission of the Apostles, ix. 1, is explained by ix. 51, x. 1.

[5] Comp. in the beginning, four miracles, four conflicts; then another four miracles after the parables; finally, a four-fold incapacity of the disciples previous to the setting out for Jerusalem (ix. 51).

points of view; the four stations, however, are not marked off by progressive stages in Jesus' monotonic announcements of his passion, but by the stages of the journey of the passion—Galilee, Samaria, Judæa, and finally the Passover at Jerusalem.[1]

Besides these Jewish-Christian main sources, several come into view from the other flank of the Church, and possess Pauline characteristics. A Samaritan source is very obvious. The Samaritan narratives of various kinds contained in this Gospel—the journey through Samaria, the picture of the compassionate, and again of the grateful Samaritan—must first have come from records of the church of that land, which, converted in the apostolic period, eagerly occupied itself in collecting the threads that bound it to the person of Jesus, who was said to have now and then encountered and singled out by his favourable notice individual Samaritans—nay, had gone about the land itself in a more friendly spirit than the Jewish Christians had supposed and represented. It would be to take an exceedingly short step to believe in an identity of this source with the accounts of the Samaritan mission which the author has made use of for the Acts of the Apostles. It is not to be supposed that these notices are the work of followers of Paul who looked upon Samaria only as a type of Gentile Christianity and its privileges, or of Luke himself writing under the influence of the same idea; in such a case we should still have had—since Samaria was neither purely Gentile nor Pauline—rather Syrian or Tyrian narratives than Samaritan. It is possible that the important account of the mission of the seventy disciples, the heralds of salvation to the whole of the non-Jewish portion of the human race, also belongs to the Samaritan source. The Judaizing spirit of the address of Jesus to the Seventy on their return, prevents us from ascribing the authorship of this account to Luke; while the close connection of this mission with the Samaritan narratives that stand in its immediate neighbourhood, is strongly suggestive of a Samari-

[1] (*a*) ix. 51; (*b*) xiii. 22; (*c*) xvii. 11. Already xvii. 12 sqq., 22 sqq., and especially xviii. 15, point to Judæa. (*d*) xix. 11.

tan source. On the other hand, it must remain an open question whether the instructions given by Jesus to the Seventy, as they now stand in Luke, were taken from the source itself, or were rather prepared by Luke, doubtless on the basis of the instructions given to the Twelve in Matthew.

It is more difficult to point out purely Pauline sources. One cannot always discover with certainty what the author owes to oral tradition, and what he has derived from Jewish sources—as in the preliminary history—and has altered with a free hand in a Pauline direction. Individual narratives, such as those of the woman who was a sinner, and of Martha and Mary, could have grown up also in a Jewish-Christian soil. We may, however, regard it as fairly probable that the following belong to Pauline sources: the account of the last supper, which, although an independent one, closely corresponds with that of Paul; the series of narratives which set forth and magnify forgiving grace, the humility of penitent faith without works, the Abrahamic disposition of certain Jews, and the compassionate reception of the Gentile; and more particularly the narratives of the woman who was a sinner, of Mary, of the prodigal son, of the publican, and of the unprofitable servants. Many of these passages exhibit a somewhat late origin, since they are partly composed out of earlier Jewish material (as, e.g., the narrative of the woman who was a sinner), and have partly grown out of the post-apostolic reconciliation of the two parties (as, e.g., the prodigal son).[1]

[1] Luke x. 8 from 1 Cor. x. 27; vii. 37 from Matt. xxvi. 7; xv. 11 from Matt. xviii. 11. The opinion that the *Ebionite sources of Luke* and of the *Gospel of the Hebrews* are closely related, is continually gaining strength. Comp. the resemblances: *The woman that was a sinner*, Luke vii. 37, and Papias ap. Eus. 3, 39. John viii. 3 differs from both in expression, and in the supposition of a woman guilty, not of many sins, but of one. *The lost son*, Luke xv. 13, 30, and Eus., Theoph. (a dissolute menial). *The rich man and the poor Lazarus*, Luke xvi. 19 sqq., and Origen upon Matt., *Tract.* 15 (Matt. xix. 19). *The rich ruler*, Luke xviii. 22, and Origen, *l.c.* (differently, Matt. xix. 21). *Appearances at Jerusalem, appearance to Peter, dread of spirits, challenge to touch Jesus, eating and drinking*, Luke xxiv. 34, 39 sqq., and Ignatius, *Sm.* 3; Eus, 3, 36; Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 2, 16. The *sayings* of the daily seven-fold forgiveness, Luke xvii. 3 sq., and Jerome, *Con. Pelag.* 3, 2 (comp. Matt. xviii. 21 sq.); of deliverance from the adversary, Luke xii. 58, and Carpocr. ap.

γ.—*Aim and Plan.*

But the author still stands conspicuous by the side of and above his sources, diligently as he uses them, and valuable as they are in themselves. In the already-mentioned preface, he has told us what he proposes to offer: not precisely, as Strauss thinks, more vividness, variety, and finish, but the whole compass, the correct chronology, the exact and detailed totality of

Irenæus, 1, 25, 4 (comp. Matt. v. 25); of the sons of Abraham, Luke xiii. 16, xix. 9, and Origen, *l. c.*: filii Abrahæ. That many parts of Luke's preliminary history, Sermon on the Mount, preaching of poverty (xii. 33), harmonize with the above views (p. 98), may be noted in passing. It is important to remark that most of these passages have the benefit of the ancient attestation of the second and third sections, especially of the industrious employer of Origen (Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 2); yet more, that the lost son, the rich man and Lazarus, are contained in the Gospel of the Hebrews only in embryo, whether we ascribe the amplification of them to Luke or to the restless variation of the Gospel of the Hebrews. Hence we cannot well imagine a later enlargement of the Gospel of the Hebrews out of Luke, as is notoriously the case with the later Gospel of the Ebionites. Thus we avoid the temptation to derive the quotations of Justin and Clement, instead of from Luke simply, from the related Gospel of the Hebrews. If we accept the above relationship, then (contrary to p. 85, n. 3) the Gospel of the Hebrews precedes *Luke*. The former may have come into existence about A.D. 80, on the basis of the ancient *Matthew*, perhaps already of the interpolated Matthew, and that not merely because Hegesippus—concerning whom simply the employment of the Greek and Aramaic Gospel of the Hebrews is attested (Eus. 4, 22)—is acquainted with the incidents referring to Herod (Eus. 3, 20; Matt. ii. 1 sqq.), but also because Irenæus assumes our Matthew to be in its entirety (acccording to the context) in the hands of the Ebionites (1, 26, 2; 3, 11, 7), and as a refutation of their own tenets (3, 21, 1; 5, 1, 3), and most of all because the birth by a virgin (Matt. i. 18 sqq.) seems to be established among the Nazarenes from the time of Origen (*Con. Cels.* 5, 61, 65) and Eusebius, 3, 27 (here with express mention of the Gospel of the Hebrews). This telling fact, and the enduring dualism of a milder and of a stricter Jewish-Christian party (Nazarenes and Ebionites), not only in the time of Origen, but to some extent already in that of Justin (*Tryph.* 45 sqq.) and also of Irenæus, is ignored by Hilgenfeld (comp. pp. 19 sq.), who holds that the preliminary history—with exception of the genealogy (Epiph. 30, 14; comp. 28, 5)—was altogether wanting to the Gospel of the Hebrews, as well as to Cerinthus (better, to the Cerinthians, Ep. 30, 3). It must, however, be admitted, without qualification, that the Nazarene Gospel of the Hebrews has conformed to our Matthew in its use of the preliminary history, since Irenæus, at any rate since Origen, since the beginning of the third century. There can be no serious doubt entertained as to the connection of the Gospel of the Hebrews, in the days of Jerome and Epiphanius, with our interpolated Matthew. Jerome on Hab. iii. 3 shows the assumption that Bethlehem (comp. Pharan = the kingdom of caverns) was the birthplace of Jesus; he gives the explanation of Matt. ii. 23 (Jerome on Isa. xi. 1) from the mouth of Hebrews, probably Nazarenes;

this history.[1] We are able to recognize his purpose in his achievement. He has given the whole compass of the life of Jesus, from the childhood to the ascension, going further back and further forwards than even Matthew. He has preserved the chronology, furnishing dates, often setting aside the arrangement of subjects in groups in order to connect with each period that which belongs to it, and bringing narratives and sayings into new and often striking relations. And, finally, he is so careful of the rights of historical development *(die Rechte des Werdens)*, that he distinguishes three different forms of instructions given by Jesus to the Apostles, and even inserts before the first a narrative of the solemn choosing of "the Apostles," and naturally crowns that act of choosing with an address.[2] He has aimed at exactness of detail and completeness by interweaving a number of fresh narratives and sayings; by enlarging the old with a quantity of laboriously collected minutiæ, and partly by distinguishing between the several acts of a narrative, as in the account of Jairus' daughter; or, when the old material seemed

in Matt. ii. 15, 23 (*Vir. ill.* 3), and indeed generally, he presupposes the identity of the preliminary history; he shows that the interpolation, Matt. iv. 15 sq., was widely read among the Nazarenes (Jerome on Isa. ix. 1); he knows of a watch at the grave (*servus sacerdotis*, comp. Matt. xxvi. 51, who really does not, as Hilgenfeld supposes, exclude the Roman watch, Matt. xxvii. 65 sqq.), *Vir. ill.* 2. After all, his remark upon Matt. ii. 6 *may* also refer to the Gospel of the Hebrews. In Epiph. comp. *Haer.* 29, 9: ἔχουσι (Ναζ.) τὸ κατὰ Ματθ. εὐαγγ. πληρέστατον. Only he holds the falling away of the genealogies as possible (i. 1—17).

To sum up, I hold:—Matthew, the original work, about A.D. 66. Interpolation (essentially our Matthew), A.D. 70—80. Beginnings of the Gospel of the Hebrews, on the basis of the foregoing and of other sources, in a Jewish-Christian Ebionitic modification and enlarged form, about A.D. 80. Luke, A.D. 90. Volkmar sets Matthew, A.D. 105—110; and the Gospel of the Hebrews (out of Matthew and Luke), A.D. 120—150, *Urspr. Ev.* p. 162. In the above conclusions I have approached Hilgenfeld a little more closely.

[1] i. 1—4.

[2] vi. ix. x. xii. On the other hand, Weizsäcker (pp. 38 sqq.) is able to discover in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount and missionary address traces of a lack of originality. But where are the traces? Which is simpler — election and multifarious addresses, or no express election and one address? How erroneous is the assertion that, at the delivery of the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus had withdrawn himself from the people, who, according to Matthew, were in solemn attendance upon him; and that Matt. ix. 36—38 establishes the election, and not rather the mission!

to be untenable, by removing it altogether, as, e.g., the feeding of the four thousand and the story of the fig-tree.[1]

But it is plain that, in all this, we have not yet discovered the special purpose of the author. Doubtless, part of the completeness and accuracy which he wishes to exhibit in his book is the spirit of the Gospel, the true adjustment of the key-note of the Gospel. The ancients, without dwelling on the preface, rightly divined that the Gospel of Luke was the Gospel of Paul. They came to this conclusion from the person of the traditionary author as well as from the contents, and were even of opinion that Paul had in his Epistles referred to this, *his* Gospel.[2] On the other hand, it can undoubtedly be shown that Luke has, in the Gospel, by allusion praised and vindicated Paul.[3] Among recent critics there is no longer any dispute as to the existence of this Pauline character, and Holtzmann is not justified in declining to recognize this tendency.[4]

Much, in fact, appears altogether Pauline, especially when compared with the Gospel of the Jewish Christians. The sole right of the Jews to the kingdom of God is abrogated. We do not read that Jesus came to them alone, to the exclusion of the Gentiles. On the contrary, the first sermon in Nazareth destroys this illusion by giving preference to the Gentiles—for whom the preliminary history had already opened a way to Christ—over the Jews, among whom unbelief was diffused, not only throughout the hierarchy, but also throughout the nation.[5] Hence the interest exhibited by the Samaritans, the centurion, and the Gentiles, at the death of Jesus. Hence the numerous expressions of toleration, and the frequent reference to the call of the Gen-

[1] Comp. the two acts, viii. 41 sq. 49 (in which he is followed by Mark v. 21 sqq.), in opposition to Matt. ix. 18 sqq.

[2] Comp. Iren. 3, 14, 1: Non solum prosecutor, sed et cooperarius apostolorum, maxime autem Pauli (who in his Epistles himself refers to him). Jerome, *Cat.* 7, expressly: Scripsit evangelium, de quo idem Paulus: misimus, inquit, cum illo fratrem, cujus laus est in evangelio per omnes ecclesias (2 Cor. viii. 18).

[3] xii. 3, xiii. 25—30; comp. ix. 49, xiv. 23 (Matt. xi. 12). Comp. Strauss, pp. 124 sqq.

[4] Pp. 389 sqq.

[5] Comp. iv. 24 sqq., xiii. 26.

tiles, the journey through Samaria, and the mission of the Seventy, before whom the Twelve, Peter included, retire into the background.[1] The Law also passes away. In the place of Jesus' teaching of the Law, appears a broader preaching of morality from the Mount; questions of the Law are readily overlooked; the Law and the Prophets last only until John, and their only contents are a prediction of the Christ. A number of Pauline narratives subordinate the Law to humble faith and practical love of our neighbour, the very essence of the Law, exercised by the woman who was a sinner and by the good Samaritan. The person of Christ waxes greater: he was miraculously born of a virgin, he is one from whom miraculous virtue flows, who calls the dead from the grave, dethrones the devil and his angels, knows all things, puts the disciples to shame, speedily gathers all Galilee around him, escapes miraculously; on the cross, instead of uttering cries of anguish, he holds intercourse with God, interceding for others and committing himself into God's hands; and ultimately he visibly ascends up into heaven. Already is metaphysics beginning to busy itself with his nature: he is not the son of David, not the son of Abraham; he is the offspring of Adam; he is, as Paul taught, a second creation, which at the same time promises a new salvation to the whole world. It is even possible to find in the phrase, the "wisdom of God," a title of Jesus, and with it the first faint traces of a belief in his pre-existence.[2] Who can wonder that, under the influence of this conception, the whole structure of Jewish expectation of a kingdom, present or future, falls insensibly into decay? The kingdom is where Jesus is, though he does not wear the royal purple; and when he departs, it is still here, overcoming the world in power and in spirit.[3]

But this is only one side. The author is no harsh, no mere staunch, but an accommodating follower of Paul. The tolerance

[1] Comp. x. with ix.

[2] Comp. iii. 38. The wisdom of God, xi. 49; comp. Matt. xxiii. 34.

[3] xvii. 20, 21, ix. 27, xix. 11.

of his master is here extended, in the spirit of the post-apostolic age, to concession in theory and to compromise in church organization. On account of the peculiar contradictions in this Gospel, the critical school have believed in a two-fold authorship; and while they have so successfully established the Paulinism of the Gospel, they have, on the other hand, betrayed the fallibility of their own judgment by violently compelling the canonical Luke to give place to the mutilated Marcion Gospel, the "original Luke." The conciliatory disposition of the Pauline author expresses itself chiefly in the impartial use of sources representative of both parties, and next in the form of a principle distinctly enounced through the medium of a parable—that of the prodigal son. As in the Acts of the Apostles, so here, the author does not refuse to recognize a Jewish Christianity which within its own limits adheres to the Law, so long as it will but respect the privileges of the Gentile Christians, their repentance and their joy.[1] It is consistent with this principle that the appointment of the kingdom to Jews whose faith resembles that of Abraham is nevertheless preserved, that the saying respecting the twelve thrones of the Apostles and the twelve tribes of Israel is given, and that a repentance of Israel on Golgotha is reported.[2] The author even goes so far as to insert sayings respecting the perpetual validity of the Law; he does this at least in subordinate places, and where the context limits the bearing of those sayings, whilst, at the same time, by a decided recognition of the Ebionite principle, which Paul does not hinder him from making, he fully satisfies the spirit of the newer Jewish Christianity.[3]

It is intelligible enough that the aim of the Gospel must also determine its plan. Critics, even the cautious Bleek, are very

[1] xv. 11 sqq.

[2] xxii. 30, xxiii. 48. Comp. the expression, son and daughter of Abraham, xiii. 16, xix. 9. A similar view in Strauss, pp. 123 sq.

[3] Perpetual obligation of the Law, xvi. 17, xi. 42. Kernel of the Law, x. 26 sqq. The Jewish Christians, Iren. 3, 15, 1.

ready to talk about the traces of an original Gospel in Luke's book.[1] In point of fact, that which is ascribed to the original Gospel is often the work of Luke himself, as was stated when we were considering the sources. It has also been already pointed out how much his determination to write everything in order favoured an arrangement of the details, not in large groups, but in a more isolated manner, in which latter arrangement, however, there was not wanting an artistic combination of introductions, narratives, parables, and sayings (whether this be due, in each individual case, to Luke or his source). But let us keep the Pauline author in view. The author's Pauline tendency makes it intelligible to us that Jesus' inaugural address should be a kind of declaration of war against Judaism; that, at the very outset, there should spring up four great conflicts with the Pharisees (two concerning the paralytic and the publican, and two concerning the Sabbath), and after the sermon on morality fresh conflicts with the people and the Pharisees; and that the first main division should close with a four-fold exhibition of the weakness of the Twelve, while the second opens with another instance of such weakness.[2] Turning from Judaism, upon which the strongest evidences, the greatest miracles artistically heightened to the close of the series, have been brought to bear altogether in vain, the second main division becomes peculiarly a vindication of the rights of the Gentiles; the Lord's journey of death—the work of Judaism—does not, as Luke significantly shows, issue simply in his ascension or his being "received up," but becomes the happy occasion of the scattering of the seed among the peoples whose land the Lord treads and ennobles by his sublimest utterances concerning the kingdom, to whom he

[1] *Einl.* pp. 266 sqq.

[2] iv. 16 sqq., v. 17 sqq., vii. 24 sqq., ix. 28—50, 52—55. Comp. the representation of Weizsäcker (p. 44) and others, according to which Matthew unskilfully altered the original Gospel, *i.e.* placed the early controversies on the Sabbath (as if they did not belong to Luke's plan) later, and the great miracles (the storm, &c.) earlier. Cannot the removal of the great miracles to the end, viii. 22—56, ix. 10—17, also belong to the plan?

sends a multitude of enthusiastic messengers, and among whom he reaps a harvest of faith, love, gratitude, and success.

δ.—*Credibility.*

There can be no doubt that the book was composed by the Apostle Paul's fellow-worker.[1] At least it is not conceivable that mere surmise should have fastened upon a name which occupies a by no means prominent position in the Roman Epistles of the Apostle. It is also clear that a man who was a fellow-worker with the Apostle first about the year 62 (for all that is said as to his accompanying Paul on the second journey, about the year 54, is mere fable), might still write about the year 90, and that he might write in such a manner, i. e., as at a distance from the events, and in an accommodating spirit.[2]

We are, at length, to some extent in a position to answer the question which is of the highest importance for the life of Jesus. This Gospel offers much new material, many fresh combinations, many fresh points of view. We dare not undervalue the fresh contributions to the evangelical history which Luke has drawn from his sources. Many a passage from sources which in themselves are not very old, may nevertheless have descended from a primitive Christian antiquity. This can apply both to Pauline and Samaritan sources: is it wholly improbable that Jesus occa-

[1] Strauss, however, following Hilgenfeld, Köstlin, Volkmar, and Zeller, doubts it, p. 127. Only he does not explain what has led men to refer to Luke the "we" of the Acts of the Apostles, which he rightly does not apply to him. Earliest testimonies, *Mur. Frag.*, Iren., Clem. Comp. above, p. 96.

[2] Luke makes his first appearance in Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11. The Apostle was evidently acquainted with him at Rome. Whatever opinion may be held concerning the Acts, whether the whole or only half the book be ascribed to Luke, we must not here adopt an hypothesis like that which is well known in the question of the authorship of John's Gospel—that Luke was prevented by his modesty from mentioning himself, or has done so but once in the "we." According to the Acts, it is impossible that any one but Silas and Timothy should have accompanied Paul to Europe (comp. Acts xv. 40, xvi. 3, 10), and 2 Cor. i. 19 confirms this impossibility.

sionally met with Samaritans whom Jewish-Christian narrators did not notice, whom they were pleased to pass over in silence? The Ebionite Gospel stood still nearer to the scene of the history of Jesus, and many a priceless utterance of the Lord's, many a real action of his, may have been here preserved; but it is of almost more value to be able to make a critical comparison of the particular setting and juxtaposition of the sayings and narratives with Matthew, at least to establish the historical uncertainty of many of the combinations which have been more or less freely or artistically made. On the other hand, it must not be concealed that these very sources of Luke's necessitate extreme caution and vigilance in the use of this Gospel. All of them are, without doubt, of later date than the groundwork of Matthew; and the preference is therefore to be given to the latter in disputed points when the merits are otherwise equal, even though here and there the superior claim of Luke's rendering to originality is unmistakable, e. g. in the narrative of the good teacher (xviii. 18). The legends and tendencies of a later age also are more strongly infused. Not merely is it necessary to exercise the greatest caution with reference to the exaggerated miracles, whether that of the young man who was being borne to the grave, or of the Lord's bespeaking the room for his last supper; but the stress laid by the Ebionite source on poverty, the Samaritan journey, and the sending forth of the Seventy, in which the Samaritan church believed, as well as the harmonizing of the parties in the Pauline manuscript,—these can scarcely be original.

Still stronger are the suspicions that gather round the author who used all these sources, in spite of his having used them. Origen attempted to establish, from Luke's preface, that while Luke's predecessors had written rashly, he himself had been securely guided by the Holy Spirit. But however conscientiously he might engage in his work, to him also, as one born out of season, the task of reproducing the true history from conflicting

and contradictory sources, was, as the Muratorian Fragment admits, a hazardous one.[1] There was no attempt at a searching criticism of his sources, on which he implicitly relied; and the composition of the whole rested upon a subjective estimate of his materials. This estimate was regulated formally by the rules which he had laid down for himself in the preface, but religiously and as to the matter by his Paulinism. Hence he wrote a history, not falsifying his facts, like a writer of romance or an ecclesiastical partizan, but giving them as he believed they had occurred, or, in some instances, were most likely to have occurred. He has, notwithstanding, in many cases done violence to the actual history, and has done this himself, irrespective of his sources. There can be no doubt that he, the practised writer, amended the chronology in accordance with the standpoint of his age; omitted or altered what was legal or Jewish-Christian, even when he found it in his sources; and, in spite of all his sources, of all history, of all consistent development, and of Paul himself, inserted at the very beginning the great perspective of the sermon at Nazareth, and further on, the long Samaritan journey and the instructions to the seventy disciples of the Gentiles, which instructions he borrowed from those given to the Twelve. A study of the author's plan will also reveal the degree of licence taken by him, which can be extensively traced. We need but mention (without reference to his Paulinism) his formal view of the sequence of events. What a host of artificial combinations: narratives sometimes preceded by programmes and introductions, sometimes illustrated by metaphors and sayings; series of controversies, or of exhibitions of weakness on the part of the disciples, in his favourite quadruple form; miracle succeeding miracle, until the studied climax is reached! In every instance must the lauded originality first be sought out,

[1] The Fragment speaks more unfavourably of Luke than of Mark. Of the latter it says: Quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit. Of Luke it says: Nomine suo *ex opinione* conscripsit. Dominum tamen nec ipse vidit in carne. Et idem, *prout assequi potuit* (comp. Luke i. 1).

and the claims of Luke as against Matthew made evident, by diligent investigation.[1]

(C.)—Mark.

α.—*Date.*

We come now to the shortest of the Synoptical Gospels, to which, notwithstanding its internal evidences of a later date, the most recent critics have ascribed the highest antiquity.[2]

Mark's Gospel itself refutes the advocates of its high antiquity. The predictions of Jesus are certainly somewhat less altered, and the fact that the siege and destruction of Jerusalem are past events is less apparent, than in Luke; but many of its characteristics point to the same date, or rather to one still further removed, to a post-apostolic, post-Jerusalemitic age. Careful corrections of the predictions of Jesus are not wanting in this Gospel: the signs of his coming are not "immediately" to follow the fall of Jerusalem, the hierarchy are not "from this time forth" to see Jesus coming and sitting in glory, and the last survivors of the band of disciples will not be able to see the Son of Man, but only the kingdom of God, come "with power."[3]

[1] Examples: Programmes, iv. 16 sqq., 33 sqq., xix. 11 sqq. Introductions, xi. 1 sqq., xii. 41 sqq., &c. Combination of figures and narratives: mission and fishing, v. 1 sqq.; Nain and the passage about John, vii. 11 sqq. Sending forth the Apostles and the miracle of feeding, ix. 1—17, comp. ver. 13. Combination of sayings with sayings, and of sayings with narratives, *e. g.* the passage about the Law and the rich man, xvi. 16 sqq. "Our Father" and the parables, xi. 1 sqq. The sayings about taking no thought, and about the husbandman, xii. 6 sqq. Series of miracles: comp. the greatest miracles at the end—the storm, the Gadarene, Jairus, the woman with the issue of blood, viii. 22—56, and the miracle of feeding, ix. 12 sqq. The healing of the lunatic, ix. 38 sqq., stands in the four or five-fold exhibition of the incapacity of the disciples. Only a part of these artificial combinations, chiefly those of xi.—xvii., could be derived from the Ebionite source.

[2] Besides the principal works, comp. Baur, *Das Markus-Evangelium*, 1851, and the articles by Baur, Hilgenfeld, and Zeller, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* and in the *Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theol.*

[3] xiii. 24, xiv. 62, ix. 1. Comp., in each case, Matt. and Luke.

The future of Christ is altogether uncertain; he himself knows not the hour, and it is possible that all the watches of the night will have passed away before he comes.[1] In the place of the invisible Lord, the date of whose return cannot be fixed, appears, even more prominently than in Luke, the kingdom of God on earth, and its blessings. The kingdom of God grows whilst its Lord sleeps; it presses onward mightily; and before the end comes, the earthly blessings of the disciples shall be multiplied a hundred-fold, though those blessings shall be to some extent mingled with the sorrows of persecution.[2] The Gospel takes the place of Christ, the Twelve are replaced by the community, which bears the name of Christ, and is, even up to Gethsemane, the special and ultimate recipient of his admonitions.[3] No passage is a better indication of its later date, of a date subsequent to Matthew and Luke, than that of the earthly blessings: "A hundred-fold in this present time—houses, brethren, sisters, mothers, children, and lands, with persecutions." This saying, compared with Matthew and Luke, shows the full and wide naturalization of Christianity on earth, which Mark further confirms by a significant toning down of the words of Jesus against riches, and by promising happy and peaceful times, occasionally interrupted by storms of persecution.[4] In addition to the above, we have the name of Christian, and the triumphant extension of the community, growing, as a silent miracle, out of the Master's seed-corn.[5] We are reminded of the time immediately preceding the protracted war against the new religion waged by the Emperor Trajan, and of the transient persecutions at Rome under Nero and Domitian. Its relations to Luke, as well as to John,

[1] xiii. 32, 35; comp. Matt. xxiv. 42.

[2] iv. 28, x. 30. Comp. the difference between the latter passage and Matt. xix. 28 sq., and even Luke xviii. 30.

[3] The Gospel, for the Gospel's sake, comp. i. 15, viii. 35, x. 29; while in Matthew it is "for my sake," Matt. x. 18 sqq. The community, Mark iv. 10, 36, viii. 32, 34 (in Matt., only the disciples), xiii. 37, &c.

[4] x. 30, comp. 24.

[5] ix. 41, iv. 28.

also suggest the year 100 as the approximate date of the last of the Synoptical Gospels, which the consistent Mark-hypothesis places first, i. e. in the year 60, or at least not later than A.D. 80 (Volkmar).

The testimony of the Fathers leads us to the same conclusion. Irenæus has placed the composition of the Gospel of Mark, as well as that of Luke, in distinction to that of Matthew, after the death of the great Apostles.[1] Clement placed it before their death; and Eusebius, in a fabulous chronology, in the beginning of the reign of the Emperor Claudius, about A.D. 42.[2] Everything supports the view that Mark wrote after Matthew; and the earliest Fathers, Clement, Irenæus, and Tertullian, are in favour of the priority of Luke also.[3] But since Papias and Justin, Mark has been admitted into the New Testament as a "disciple of the Apostles," just as Luke was; and by the Roman Church—as early as the Muratorian Fragment—then by Origen and his successor Eusebius, he was, as companion of Peter the prince of the Apostles, placed before the disciple of Paul.[4] Finally, the references to Mark are later and more doubtful; the first certain, though slight traces are in Hermas, Justin, the Clementines, as well as in Papias, who gives the name, while Justin seems to have honoured the book with the patron's name.[5] The Gospel can boast of a preference only at the hands

[1] *Hær.* 3, 1, 1: Post vero horum excessum Marcus, discip. et interpres Petri; comp. 3, 10, 6.

[2] Clem. ap. Eus. 6, 14, at the time of Peter's preaching in Rome. Eus. 2, 14—16, represents Peter as going to Rome in the beginning of the reign of Claudius (*Chron.* 2nd year), to oppose Simon Magus. Comp. Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 8, 11.

[3] Iren. 3, 10, 6. Clem. ap. Eus. 6, 14. Tert. *Con. Marc.* 4, 2. Jerome, 7, 8. In opposition to Schenkel, p. 332.

[4] Origen ap. Eus. 6, 24. Eus. 3, 24; (Peter) 2, 14. *Mur. Frag.* tertio—Lucam. Comp. Iren. 3, 1, 1.

[5] Herm. 1, 3, 6, 9; 2, 9. Clem. *Hom.* 3, 56, 57; 2, 19. Justin, *Tryph.* 106 (Simon Peter, Boanerges), one quotation. According to the most probable interpretation, *ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ* = Πέτρου, and the Gospel of Mark = Peter. Papias, Eus. 3, 39.

of many of the Gnostics of the second century.[1] The advocates of the Mark-hypothesis are accustomed to explain the neglect of this Gospel by the Fathers on the ground that Matthew, rich in extent, material, and composition, as well as bearing an Apostle's name, supplanted the "short, compendious, cropped-fingered" Mark.[2]

β.—The Sources.

This Gospel has a few narratives and sayings not given by Matthew and Luke. This special property of Mark may be partly ascribed to oral tradition, to which certain of his new-found names, as Alexander and Rufus (xv. 21), clearly point; but for the most part it is derived from written, and particularly from Jewish-Christian sources; e. g. the two narratives of the deaf mute and of the blind man at Bethsaida, the parables of the seed growing of itself, of salt and of fire, of the lord returning home, and the Aramaic words used by Jesus, and names such as Boanerges, Dalmanutha, Bartimæus.[3] Many of these additions undeniably exhibit a later colouring. The parables of the seed and of the lord point to apostolic and post-apostolic times; the miracles of healing exhibit mysterious and extensive manipulations on the eyes, ears, and skin, with hand, spittle, and oil—manipulations unknown to the earliest Gospels, and even to the Acts of the Apostles, but known to the fourth Gospel and

[1] Iren. 3, 11, 7: Qui Jesum separant a Christo (Cerinthus and others) et impassibilem *perseverasse* Christum, passum vero Jesum dicunt, id quod sec. Marcum est, præferentes evangelium.

[2] Breve evangelium, Jerome, *Cat.* 8; comp. Iren. 3, 11, 8. Μάρκος ὁ κολοβοδάκτυλος, Hipp. *Phil.* 7, 30. Baur, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 93; Volkmar, 1854, p. 117. A late ecclesiastical fable (in the *Cod. Amiat. præf. Hier. in Mc.*) tells of a self-mutilation in order to disqualify himself for the priesthood(!) (Duncker, pp. 393 sq.); this fable is ascribed to the philosophers. But it is clear that the philosophers wish to ridicule the short Gospel as such, and not as abridged and maimed by Mark (as Duncker, Hilg., Volk. suppose). The ridicule was encouraged by Hipp.'s supposition that Marcion made use of this very Gospel, which had already fallen somewhat into disrepute through its use by other Gnostics.

[3] Comp. the novelties of Mark in Hilgenfeld, pp. 146 sq.

to the Fathers.[1] Finally, names unknown to others indicate on that very ground a later date, especially when they betray design and heightened emphasis, as in the case of Bartimæus, the blind man, doubly unfortunate, since (according to Hitzig) he was a blind man's son, or, as others understand the passage, the son of the impure, of the leprous, not exactly of the Gentile.

The ever-recurring points of contact of Mark with Matthew and Luke favour the assumption first made by Griesbach, then scientifically established by Baur, only half admitted by Hilgenfeld, and altogether rejected on insufficient grounds by the latest critics—the assumption of a double dependence of Mark upon these Gospels. Those who echo this view, as the arrogant defenders of the Mark-hypothesis are accustomed to express themselves, can not only appeal to the facility with which the whole of Mark might be constructed out of Matthew and Luke, but can also allow the notoriously later date of Mark, the evidently greater originality of the views of his predecessors, and his everywhere apparent adaptation of his material to a later age, to speak for themselves. We cannot here devote ourselves to the examination of every detail, to the enumeration of all the little fresh passages in Mark, of which, however, the general spirit of the Gospel will give us some idea; a few of the points of view that might otherwise be overlooked in the mass of details must here suffice.

Mark's dependence upon Matthew is established not only by the almost exact retention of the sequence of events, the authorship of which must reasonably be ascribed to the more creative of the Evangelists, but also by the identity and, at the same time, inferiority of the leading divisions. Hitherto, this question has been too hastily dismissed in the case of Mark, as well as in that of Luke. In harmony with Matthew, but differing from Luke, Mark has evidently placed the epoch-making turning-point of the life of Jesus in the prediction of his passion and —almost still more markedly—in the immediately preceding

[1] Comp. vi. 13 with Luke ix. 6, 11.

avowal of his Messiahship at Cæsarea Philippi.[1] In harmony with this, his second division is also marked by the monotonous passion-cry, tolling-in the ever nearer-approaching end, only that, in spite of an otherwise perfect similarity of the extremely heightened situation, the last cry, the Passover-cry, has disappeared.[2] This is one sign of the less attentive copyist. But the most evident signs lie in the first part. The way in which the critical incident at Cæsarea, upon which all depends, is introduced, exhibits an utter absence of the keen and unfailing discernment of the first Evangelist. Mark does not say, *From henceforth* Jesus began to show unto his disciples that he must go to Jerusalem, must suffer, be slain, and rise again; but he briefly and carelessly connects the future with the past, *And* he began to teach them that he must suffer. This may be in harmony with the author's wish (again another sign) to lay greater stress upon Jesus' announcement of his glory than upon that of his passion; but how could he then, except as one not relying on himself, but dependent upon another, make the announcement of the passion the foundation of the whole of the second part? This, however, is not the most striking point of all. The great transition-point must not only be described, it must be introduced. In Matthew it has such an introduction in the second, third, and fourth stations, especially in the last, in the last section preceding the narrative of what occurred at Cæsarea. Jesus wages his decisive battle with the Pharisees, escapes from them towards Tyre and Sidon, returns to a desert place near the sea, where he feeds the four thousand, escapes a second time from the Pharisees and Sadducees, whose temptation he cuts short with a word, and makes a long journey, as he had previously done in the north-west, now in the north-east, in the wild, lonely, mountainous country of Lebanon, among the sources of the Jordan, near Cæsarea Philippi, and there for the first time

[1] viii. 27 sqq.

[2] (*a*) viii. 27. (*b*) ix. 30. (*c*) x. 32. (*d*) xiv. 1.

he announces the death which it is impossible for him to evade.[1] How completely has Mark, the ignorant and undiscerning copyist, missed the spirit and meaning of this indispensable and momentous stage in the history of Jesus! He has indeed given the important sections of Matthew—the trenchant sermon to the Pharisees, the journey to Tyre, the feeding of the four thousand, the temptation by the Pharisees; but after transposing the conflicts to the very beginning (iii. 6), he has, at the critical point, no conception whatever of the highly dramatic character of the situation, which is crowned by the death-announcement at Cæsarea Philippi. After the conflict with the Pharisees, Jesus goes calmly home, as shortly before he had retired with his wearied disciples for refreshment in the desert immediately after the death of the Baptist; he goes to Tyre without necessity; the feeding of the four thousand does not take place during his retreat; and his withdrawal from his tempters is not a flight, for he continues his ministry, and does so till he arrives at Cæsarea. We see the author very distinctly in his plan; all these narratives of what occurred in Tyre, in the desert, and among the Pharisees, are to him only narratives of miracles, not of persecution; and therefore he can unhesitatingly add to the healing of the daughter of the Tyrian woman and the feeding of the people, the altogether new passages of the deaf-mute of Decapolis and the blind man of Bethsaida: the favourite quadruple of miracles is thus completed, but Jesus' decision to suffer death—the central point of the Gospel—hovers unexplained between heaven and earth.[2] Should it be supposed, however, that Mark has better prepared the way for the proclamation of the Messiahship, or of the exaltation of Jesus, this would also be found to be a mistake. In Matthew, Jesus gives a long series of revelations as to his person, each revelation fuller than that which preceded it; and the disciples are from time to time more and more disposed to

[1] Comp. Matt. x. 24, xi. 20, xii. 14 sqq., xiv. 13, and especially xv. 1—16, 27.

[2] Mark vii. 1—31.

guess at, to utter, the highest name, that of the Messiah; but in Mark, Jesus scarcely declares himself at all, and so far as he does it, he does it only at the beginning, and the disciples, in this respect surpassed by the possessed, remain as they were in the very beginning, "without understanding," and the confession of Peter bursts upon the history as an effect without a cause.[1]

Mark is in very close agreement with Luke in the sequence of the stations as well as of the incidents of the first part. The critical points—the commencement of the ministry, the choice of the Apostles, the parables, and the mission of the Apostles—are here visible also, but a fifth station is added, that of the preaching to the Pharisees, which coincides with Matthew's fourth and last station.[2] The influence of Luke is here unmistakable. Luke, as well as Matthew, has furnished each station with sayings and acts. Mark does the same; but in the first and second stations the introductory sermon is wanting, though its traces remain, since we can detect its vacant space. The station of the inaugural sermon opens with a few words of exhortation, which are explained by the full inaugural sermon at Nazareth given by Luke; the station of the choice of the Apostles is so surprising in its meagreness, combined with the closest resemblance to Luke in its national scenery, that even Ewald has recognized, and Holtzmann has not denied, the omission of Luke's moral sermon from this place. The programmes are also an essential characteristic of Luke. The sermon at Nazareth, with the announcement of the fulfilment of prophecy, the rejection of the Jews, and the calling of the Gentiles, is a kind of initial programme. Of the nature of a programme is also the first striking act at Capernaum, a repetition of which the people at Nazareth eagerly demand; as well as the violent demoniac,

[1] Comp. Matt. viii. 27, and, like it, Mark iv. 41; but also Matt. xiv. 33 (enthusiastic greeting as the Son of God, without sober earnestness), and Mark vi. 51 sq. Jesus' declarations concerning himself previous to the disclosure at Cæsarea Philippi, Matt. v. 17 sqq., ix. 1 sqq., x. 23 sqq., xi. 1 sqq. 27 sqq., xii. 8 sqq., &c. In Mark, scarcely more than ii. 10, 28.

[2] (1) i. 14 sqq. (2) iii. 7 sqq. (3) iv. 1 sqq. (4) vi. 7 sqq. (5) vii. 1 sqq.

who recognizes Jesus as the Nazarene, as the Christ, as the destroyer of the kingdom of the devil, and who submits to his word. Indeed, all the remaining material of the first station is arranged according to the same method,—the four miracles with the result of a faith without measure, the four conflicts leading on to the opponents' resolve to employ force. Mark has also observed this method, but not so rigidly, and sometimes with exaggeration. The violent demoniac makes his appearance at Capernaum, and is yet more terrible than in Luke, but the powerful introductory sermon has disappeared; the whole series of miracles and conflicts also follows, but the numerical symmetry is lost, and the double quadruple has become a triplet and a quadruple.[1] Luke's programme compels him, contrary to the progressive development he might have given, and which is the dominant feature in Matthew, to introduce a maturity of character in Jesus, as well as of the mesh of antagonisms in which he was involved. The same mature Christ is found also in Mark, only yet more exaggerated. The highest utterances of Jesus are undoubtedly in the first chapter, the concourse of people is boundless, and his adversaries prematurely resolve to put him to death. A combination of the points of view of Matthew and Luke here most evidently betrays itself: with the former, he places Jesus' solemn declaration of himself, at the close; with the latter, at the beginning: with the former, the deadly plot of the opponents, at the end; with the latter, at the beginning.[2] Yet another of Luke's programmes. In Luke, the decisive setting out upon the death-journey, with the richly beneficent progress through Samaria, is wrapped up in a double expression of toleration on the part of Jesus, evidently the peculiar composition of this author. But Mark also has the first of these expressions of toleration immediately before the

[1] i. 14 sq., 21 sqq. The miraculous draught of fishes is rejected from the four miracles (Luke v. 1).

[2] Comp. i. 28, 33—45, ii. 1 sqq. Significant utterances, ii. 10, 28. Plan for his murder, iii. 6. With this, comp. Luke and his relative simplicity, especially Luke iv. 37 sqq., vi. 11.

setting out on the journey to Jerusalem; but since the journey through Samaria is omitted, the saying stands isolated and destitute in the midst of the context.[1] The Samaritan journey reminds us of another of Luke's points of view,—the Gentile-favouring prominence given to the larger circle of disciples, and the striking depreciation of the Jewish Twelve. Mark has both of these; but the larger circle of disciples is merely an indistinct, shadowy form, which acquires a definite shape only by a reference to the Seventy in Luke, and the conspicuous indefiniteness is made yet more conspicuous by a completer depreciation of the Twelve with reference to their shadowy rivals, than is the case in Luke.[2] Finally, Luke, as well as his sources, is the patron of poverty, of the giving away of one's goods. Whence did Mark, no enemy of riches, no protector of naked poverty, derive his story of the poor widow?[3] In order to raise the impression of Mark's want of originality to a certain conviction, nothing further is necessary than what is offered in the ensuing section—a glance at the alteration of the text in individual cases, and the demonstration of the motives which led to a combined dependence and independence in the composition of the Gospel.

γ.—*Spirit, Aim, and Plan of the Gospel.*

Mark proclaims the newness of Christianity: it is from its beginning a new doctrine, clothed with power, and its living, strongly-marked central point is the person of Jesus.[4] It is true that the last words of the short introduction, "The Gospel of Jesus Christ, *the Son of God*," though strongly attested, must

[1] Luke ix. 49—56; Mark ix. 38—40. The displacement of the mission of the Apostles is also groundless, apart from a reference to Luke. See above, p. 102.

[2] The "people" everywhere; they even take precedence of the Apostles, especially in the early chapters, i. 27—45, ii. 2, &c. Comp. iii. 32 sqq. (Matt. xii. 49). Mark iv. 11 is certainly so much the more unintelligible, in spite of its being toned down. The wider circle, iv. 10, 36, viii. 34, xiii. 37. Depreciation of the Twelve, vi. 51 sq., vii. 18, viii. 17, ix. 19, 32.

[3] xii. 42 sqq.; comp. x. 24, 30. Also Luke xxi. 1 sqq., xviii. 24.

[4] διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν, i. 27.

be erased on the strength of the Sinaitic manuscript (as Tischendorf has done in his eighth edition), and must be regarded as an interpolation from John; yet the watchword of the book is the Son of God—nay, going beyond the standpoint of Matthew and Luke, the only, the well-beloved Son of God, who stands high above the angels and next to God himself. Nor is the conception attached to the phrase merely a Messianic one, but that of the most marvellous endowment of spirit and power, a conception which seems to be tacitly based upon a supernatural birth of "the Son of Mary."[1] So far, Köstlin is justified in speaking of a tendency to bring the divinity of Jesus into prominence. The personality of Jesus is here more mysterious than in either of the earlier Gospels. He speaks in brief, incisive, hurried words of command; his ideas are not understood; his knowledge of the future embraces the most minute details, even to the exact order of the crowings of the cock; in his works of healing, which are scarcely any more to be reckoned as miracles, he uses, as if he were in truth one of the Magi, Aramaic language and mysterious and extraordinary means; his general procedure is breathless, impetuous, incomprehensible, as when he escapes even from his disciples, sometimes in the middle of the night, and when he hides himself on his journeys; yet he is above all things heroic even to death, so that his passiveness under temptation, in spite of devils and wonderful wild beasts, which appear in Mark, is diminished, as are also even the struggles in Gethsemane, where the storm of prayer is shortened, and on Golgotha, where his life is ended by no wail of agony, but by the startling cry of the hero.[2] The impression produced

[1] i. 24, iii. 11, v. 7, xv. 39; εἷς ὑ. ἀγαπ., xii. 6 (comp. Luke xx. 13). Angels, xiii. 32. Spirit, ii. 8, iii. 29, viii. 12. Son of Mary, vi. 3 (comp. Matt. xiii. 55). According to Hilgenfeld, Mark here has respect for the antipathy of the Roman Gentiles to the birth by a virgin (p. 149).

[2] Hurried speech, xiv. 41, 42. Incomprehensible, vi. 51, sq., vii. 18, viii. 17, ix. 19, 32. Knowledge, xi. 2 sqq., xiv. 12 sqq., 30. Healing no special δύναμις, vi. 5. Aramaic, v. 41, vii. 34. Means, vii. 32 sqq., viii. 22 sqq. Waiting, with helping miracles, vi. 48. Hurried procedure, i. 35 sqq., vii. 24, ix. 30. Heroic, x. 32. Hiding, vii. 24. Temptation, i. 12 sqq. Gethsemane, xiv. 36, 39. Compare also

upon the disciples and the people is that of amazement and fear, while the possessed are alarmed into a terrified confession of his divine greatness. People believe him to be in ecstasy, and are afraid to approach him; and when he goes as a hero to Jerusalem, his alarmed disciples follow him afar off.[1] This picture of the Lord is different from that in Matthew and even in Luke; his human nature is passing out of sight, the incarnate divinity rises above the horizon—a picture dear to the Gnostics, who venerated this Gospel of the "passionless Christ," but to us suspiciously suggestive of the life of a magician.

What is new in his doctrine? Above all, his own character, as well as his demand that men should believe on himself.[2] Faith is often challenged, its nature described, not without traces of Pauline teaching. It is faith in him who, in the midst of his unapproachable greatness, is able to give material and spiritual help. One part of the novelty of his teaching consists in his opposition to the ruling powers—the Law, Judaism. Like John's Gospel, this book speaks of "the Jews." There is not a word in the book concerning the perpetuity of the Law—a necessary consequence of the attitude ascribed to Jesus; the very name of the Law has disappeared.[3] References of any kind to the Old Testament are very rare. The author delights to

the sacred unprofaned colt (with Luke xix. 30, against Matt. xxi. 2), xi. 2. Concerning the Aramaic language of Mark, comp. Eus. 4, 11, on the Gnostics: ἄλλοι δὲ Ἑβραϊκὰ ὀνόματα ἐπιλέγουσι πρὸς τὸ μᾶλλον καταπλήξασθαι τοὺς τελουμένους. And on this account, therefore, a favourite book with the Gnostics! I cannot, however, go so far with Hilgenfeld as to find the Docetic Gospel of Peter in Serapion (Eus. 6, 12) and Origen on Matt. x. 17, immediately related to our Mark (*N. T. extra can.*, p. 41); nor can I, with him and Credner, refer to that source many quotations by Justin and Clement, since both evidence and probability are wanting. That Justin and Clement made a preponderant use of our Gospels; that Justin's Memoirs of Peter, one of his sources, point simply, by Mark iii. 16, sq. (*Tryph.* 106), to our Mark, that "Gospel of Peter" according to Papias (Eus. 3, 39), Irenæus (3, 1, 1; 10, 6), Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 4, 5), Jerome (*Vir ill.* 1, 8); that, finally, of the apocryphal books, those which were the more ecclesiastical—the Gospel of the Hebrews, James—were preferred—these things belong to the unquestionable facts of this province.

[1] iv. 41, ix. 6, 15, x. 24, 32. Ecstasy, iii. 21.

[2] ix. 22 sqq., xi. 22 sqq.

[3] The Jews, vii. 3. Only ἐντολή, vii. 8, x. 19.

relate the attacks of Jesus, not only upon Pharisaism, but also upon Mosaism and its institutions—those old wine-skins of sacrifice, of the Sabbath, of the marriage law—and even upon the temple; and he could not do this in more marked contrast with Matthew than when he exhibits Jesus as directly provoking the contradiction of his opponents upon the marriage question, by a reference to Moses: What has Moses commanded *you?*[1] The Jewish particularism is quite lost. It is true that, together with the particularistic passages of Matthew, the antagonistic passages of Luke are also wanting; but, on principle, and by no means merely in the heat of controversy, Jesus throughout declares that the Gentiles stand second in a series in which the Jews stand first; and the well-known saying that the bread belongs to Israel and not to the dogs, receives the conciliatory sense of Israel first, then the dogs![2] Hence the twelve tribes and the twelve thrones are also wanting, and in some sense even the Messiah; while at the same time the strange saying of the universal hatred of "the Gentiles" towards the Christians is generalized into the hatred of "all men."[3]

The antagonism between Christianity and Judaism is not the author's last word. There stands a Law above the Law, Moses above the Pharisees and above himself. The divine commands of love to God and love to man, the Ten Commandments, all moral virtues in contrast with vice, are inculcated by Jesus; and the sum of all religion is most impressively epitomized, and then confirmed by the scribe, in the Old Testament conception of a monotheistic and moral religion, which rises above sacrifice and burnt-offering.[4] Even the Jewish place of worship, apparently

[1] x. 5, comp. Matt. xix. 8. The decay of the Sabbath, not only in ii. 23, iii. 1 sqq., but also (in opposition to Matt. xxiv. 20) xiii. 18.

[2] vii. 27.

[3] The name Son of David does indeed occur (x. 47, xi. 10), and the coming again, but more rarely than in Matthew. The title Son of God occurs more frequently, and "the Gospel" and the "kingdom of God" are mentioned instead of the person of Jesus, viii. 35, ix. 1, x. 29, xii. 34. The earlier conception, "Gospel of the kingdom," is wanting, xiii. 10, xiv. 9. Hatred of all men, xiii. 13 (Matt. xxiv. 9).

[4] vii. 1—23, xii. 28—34. Comp. Matt. xxii. 35 sqq.

the stronghold of particularism, is with largeness of heart thrown open; the temple is, according to Isaiah, the house of prayer for all nations, and yet is, according to the last utterances of Jesus, if not altogether a holy place, still a place which shrinks from what is profane.[1] Thus the author is singularly at one with Luke, and yet different. In many respects he has inveighed even more strongly than Luke against the Law and the national limitations, which, according to him, Jesus had broken down from the very first, and not subsequently to and because of his conflict with the people; the author has freed Jewish as well as Gentile Christianity from the Law, while Luke was willing to allow a distinction to remain—a Jewish Christianity subject to the Law, by the side of a Gentile Christianity free from the Law. But, on the other hand, he has vindicated an eternal place for the true, spiritual, Moral Law, has made Jews and Gentiles subject to it, and has bound them together by it into one truly united Church. He has been usually reckoned a Jewish Christian, whilst Volkmar, following an ancient precedent, would make him Pauline.[2] Both opinions have some foundation, and in any case he has learned from Paul. Since he is himself a Jew, as appears from his acquaintance with the Jewish language and customs, since he avoids the more pronounced Paulinism, since he differs from Paul in asserting the perpetual validity of Mosaism for all men, since he is so fond of insisting upon the faith of the people, that Jesus' words of rejection (iv. 11) become almost unintelligible, he is most probably to be regarded as favouring the free Jewish-Christian tendency which made terms with Paulinism, and which, in conjunction with the latter, founded the Church of the second century, the Church of the fusion, the Church of all men, the Church of the new law.

Mark has not explained himself as to the object of his Gospel. The introductory designation is general enough to be suitable to either of the Gospels; and only those who still defend the

[1] xi. 17, xiii. 14.

[2] Comp. *Const. Ap.* 2, 57: *συνεργοὶ Παύλου* (Luke and Mark).

genuineness of the Gospel of "the Son of God" can affirm that his aim was somewhat similar to that of the fourth Gospel, viz., to offer a proof of the more exalted nature of Jesus. We are thus compelled to gather his purpose from his actual and characteristic performance; and we are in this way by no means induced to give up the acquisitions of the so-called Tübingen tendency-criticism in favour of Holtzmann's belief in the absence of tendency. It is evident that Mark's special concern is to open the way for his own particular manner of regarding "the new doctrine with new power," the doctrine of the person and work of Christ, of the Law, and of the relation of Jews and Gentiles in the kingdom of God.[1] This attempt stands naturally in the closest relation to the already existing Gospels, especially Matthew and Luke. Matthew was in a certain sense hyper-Jewish, Luke hyper-Pauline. The Church was bewildered by the marked contradictions of both the spirit and the matter of the two Gospels, and in uncertainty with reference to its most sacred possession. Mark stepped forth as mediator both in spirit and in matter. His purpose was to bring together the best and most certain of both schools, and by means of definite and self-evident deductions from both, to unite in his book the sympathies of both sides, and in his conciliatory tendency the two diverging tendencies. He stood nearer to Matthew, because he himself to some extent stood on Jewish-Christian ground, and because Matthew's Gospel was early the favourite book of the Jewish-Christian circle; Luke was merely his second source, yet it was valuable to him, not only as the text-book of the other party, but also from its points of view, its new material, and its revised sequence of events.[2]

He furthered his purpose by the attractiveness which he sought to give to his work by means of a more artistic form. Here also is he in harmony with his age, and far outdoes, as even Weizsäcker admits, Luke's transformation of the history. He is an author in a flower-bedecked garment. In the first

[1] i. 27, iii. 8, vi. 5.

[2] Similarly, Gfrörer, Strauss, p. 132.

place, he writes a brief, perspicuous, compendious work; he avoids wearisome discourses on doctrine, which, moreover, were not perfectly intelligible to any but to the Jewish Christians; and he gives, in preference, narratives that contained colour and show, and were full of action. He gives a charm also to the teaching by clothing it in a vivid style, or by veiling it mysteriously in a foreign language. He makes the narratives more effective by the contrast between rapid progression—marked by the continually repeated "immediately"—and contemplative stillness, painting the scenery with a thousand touches, the house, the sea, the followers, the growing throng, the names of certain individuals, the numbers of the men and of the animals and of the pieces of money, the greenness of the grass, the pillow in the stern of the boat on Gennesareth—all given with a preference for affectionate and familiar diminutives, and in the present tense. With Luke, he has suppressed the specific designation of the sacred foal on which Jesus rode into Jerusalem, preferring to allow the Westerns to think rather of a young horse than of an ass. Add to this the behaviour and bearing, the tones and expressions of Jesus, of his disciples, of those who sought healing, and of those who were healed. He is a most anxious guide, not only of the reader's observation and perception, but also of his thought. He explains the customs of the Jews and the sayings of Jesus, which indeed Jesus himself is represented as giving either in circumlocutions, or in a form more intelligible as well as less offensive to the Gentiles; he confirms the facts and sayings by the often repeated "For;" he makes the works of healing and the miracles, especially in the case of new examples, as conceivable as possible by the artistic introduction of a gradation of stages; and he points out the incontestable and minute fulfilment of the Lord's sayings.[1] That he

[1] Circumlocutions, comp. the unusual expansion in vii. 18 sqq. Unhistorical but more intelligible formulæ, ii. 27, vi. 8, x. 11 sqq., 24. Notice in x. 12 the omission of the reference to celibacy in Matt. xix. 10 sqq. The foal, xi. 2 sqq. (in Matt. and John an ordinary ass). Gradation of stages, v. 23 sqq., viii. 22 sqq., xi. 13, 14, 20 sqq. The fulfilment of the words of Jesus, comp. xi. 14, 21, xiv. 30, 68, 72.

was not, however, always successful in these colourings and illustrations, that his narratives and sayings are throughout of but secondary value, will be best seen in the section in which we consider the historical worth of the book.

These peculiarities stand more or less closely related to the circle of readers whom the author had chiefly in view. The more exact description of the customs of the "Jews," the removal of the specifically Jewish passages, the doctrinal utterances and allusions of Jesus, the introduction of the Gentile law of marriage in the place of the Jewish—all this shows that at any rate he thought *also* of Gentile Christians.[1] The ancients thought that the author addressed himself particularly to Western and Roman readers, and they even found a Roman style of language in the book; and modern investigation has established the former supposition.[2] The numerous Latinisms in Mark—exceeding those of Matthew—the mention of Rufus as a familiar name (which occurs in the Apocrypha and elsewhere as the name of a well-known member of the Roman community); and, finally, the peculiarly conciliatory spirit of the Gospel, points of contact between which and the Jewish-Christian literature of Rome Hilgenfeld and Köstlin have detected—all this points especially to Rome, and this Roman origin in its turn explains much that is in the Gospel. This Jesus, heroic even unto death, with the step of an emperor, with deeds instead of words, with a rigid observance of the moral law even to the Sabbath, which was ridiculed by the Romans as an excuse for "slothfulness," and with his mysterious miracles, was especially adapted to Roman soil; and where was this union of Pauline and Jewish Christians, of Matthew and Luke, more urgently demanded than in Rome, where Christianity had been disrupted since Paul, and where Luke's book had recently increased the confusion?

The plan of the Gospel is essentially suggested by its aim.[3]

[1] vii. 1 sqq., x. 11 sqq. Holtzmann (p. 386) thinks only of Gentile Christians.

[2] Iren. 3, 1, 1. Clem. Al. ap. Eus. vi. 14. Comp. the old inscriptions.

[3] Holtzmann believes (p. 117) that Griesbach's view necessarily establishes an

The work to be done was that of throwing out ballast, removing contradictions, combining the two great Gospels. This combination is so managed: in the first main division, Mark takes Luke chiefly for his foundation; in the second, Matthew. This is not a merely mechanical proceeding, but has its ground in the endeavour to avoid the numerous Judaistic portions of Matthew's first division, and the untrustworthy and, to some extent, indifferently elaborated extensive novelties of Luke's second division—the endless journey through Samaria, the Seventy, the unserviceable collection of sayings and short narratives, and among them the precepts of absolute poverty, which had become intolerable. When we consider the first and most important division, Mark's dependence upon Luke and his order of events is quite apparent, up to the death of the Baptist and the feeding of the five thousand; whilst from this point onwards he is so much the more unwilling to lose the introductory stages leading up to the great turning-point at Cæsarea Philippi, as they are to be found in Matthew, because he is not obliged, with Luke, to hasten past Cæsarea Philippi (the terminal point of the first division in Matthew and Mark) to the journey through Samaria to Jerusalem. This recourse to Matthew at the close of the first division explains the fact that in Mark a fifth station in that division can be distinguished, in which he differs from the two other Evangelists; he retains the conflicts with the Pharisees and the last acts previous to the turning-point at Cæsarea Philippi, which form Matthew's fourth and last station; whilst he has, by following Luke, previously made four stations (commencement of ministry, choice of the Apostles, parables, mission of the Apostles). Mark's deviations in details from one or other of his sources can generally be easily explained. Thus it is intelligible that he omitted Luke's narrative of the childhood of Jesus, because he did not find any trace of it in Matthew, and

altogether arbitrary interchange between Matthew and Luke. It has often been said that we have no right to think of the Evangelists as occupied with the mere consulting of sources, as if Luke had not consulted many more than two sources (i. 1—4)!

because he had set himself the task of delineating the heroic man; also, that he declined to endorse Luke's violent transposition of the events at Nazareth, and felt no interest in the incredible conversion of the Lord's words to Peter into an actual miraculous draught of fishes. With these exceptions, he has in the first stage accurately repeated, amplified, and given a sharper definiteness to Luke and his artistic divisions. The several evidences as to the other stations, which we have not space here to give, can easily be discovered by the help of a harmony of the Gospels; it is only necessary and reasonable to grant to the author some degree of literary freedom.

8.—*Historical Value.*

It has been shown that the main point in this book is the work of the author, and not the sources. The sources themselves, late rather than early, possessing all the marks of the restless growth of tradition, can very rarely be brought into competition with the earlier Gospels; though occasionally—in the interesting communication respecting the excitement of Jesus when engaged in works of healing, and the matter and form of certain sayings of his—it is necessary to examine whether they possess originality or not.

The most important performance of the author, the fusion of Matthew and Luke, is not without historical value. The critical judgment here exercised in selection or rejection is not always based merely upon the author's own opinion or arbitrary choice, but also upon the common tradition of the Church, which knew nothing of Luke's insertions, or which related the history of the good Master differently from Matthew. Yet we must not overrate the critical value of this selection, and the simply external expediency of a reduction of two Gospels into one for the use of the Church is not to be undervalued. Two great questions must be asked: first, how much of the fundamental conception of the nature of Jesus found in this book is to be retained? And then,

how far are we to accept Mark's deviations from the other Gospels in matters of detail?

In the general picture of Jesus we have a not infelicitous representation of his mighty and heroic action; yet that violence is done to fact is not to be mistaken. The hurried, restless character does not harmonize with the accredited picture of Christ; still less does the awful mysteriousness of a personality that won the love of mankind by love. There is hardly a trace of the development of this personality in an internal struggle of understanding and will. The representation of the teaching of Jesus is forgetful of that which was most characteristic, his doctrine concerning the Law, and almost still more forgetful of the pearl of his teaching, the proclamation of the Fatherhood of God; his call of the Jews and the Gentiles exhibits only those prominent points which a later age found useful, when men were either suspicious of or indifferent to the distinctly marked Jewish foundation to which, however, Paul bears testimony. In the description of details, the multitude of minute additions is especially striking. Many of these are harmless artistic additions, touches of vivid colouring, among which can be reckoned also many numbers and names unknown to his predecessors. But several additions are unfortunate. Sometimes they are trivial, as in the case of the "one loaf" which the disciples took with them when they embarked, or the staff to be used by the Apostles on their journey; sometimes they are wanting in artistic beauty, as when the shining garment of Jesus is compared to the product of human labour; and the want of beauty is still more apparent when, as is often the case, the sayings of Jesus are degraded to what is commonplace, to platitudes, sometimes to abstract sayings, and sometimes even to what is pedantic.[1] Sometimes they are palpably illogical, as in the case of the demoniac who adjured Jesus in the name of

[1] viii. 14, vi. 8, comp. ix. 3. Platitudes, pleonasms, and abstract sayings of Jesus, or of the author, especially vii. 8, 13, 18—23, and the catechetical passage, viii. 17. Elsewhere, iii. 13, iv. 13, vii. 29, viii. 35, x. 29, xii. 32, 38, &c.

God, as well as the remaining interpolations in this narrative; other instances are to be found in Jesus' strange explanation that the Gentiles, though dogs, should be called in the second place, the drawing near of the people in the solemn stillness of the proclamation of the passion, the quiet retirement after the death of the Baptist, and finally the notorious declaration concerning the fig-tree that was cursed, that the time of figs was not yet.[1] Sometimes they are full of exaggerations, especially in the miracles, where, as a rule, even Luke is outdone; as, e.g., the possessed Gadarene, the paralytic, the daughter of Jairus, and the woman with an issue of blood; this is also the case in the descriptions of the crowds that came together. Sometimes we find remarkable misunderstandings, as in the account of a wandering in a corn-field, where one scarcely knows which is most grotesque, the fact itself, the breaking a way through the corn, or the justification drawn from the example of David, who ate the shewbread; other examples are seen in the story of the removal of the roof to admit the paralytic, in the serious inquiry by the disciples whether they should buy two hundred pennyworth of bread, and in the reason given for the saying as to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.[2] We find, again, alterations which do violence to the words of Jesus, as in the conversation with the woman of Canaan, in the controversy with the Pharisees concerning the Sabbath and marriage, in the saying against riches, and in the justification of the purifying of the temple. Finally, there are things that contradict the history of the Old Testament and of the age in which Jesus lived; e.g., the author designates the nameless prophet of the other Gospels Isaiah, the high-priest he names Abiathar, and the brother of Antipas the tetrarch Philip; Antipas is always the king, and his guests in

[1] xi. 13.

[2] ii. 23 sqq. (comp. with this, Matt. xii. 1 sqq., Luke vi. 1 sqq., where the disciples only pluck the corn in order to eat it, and the appeal to David eating has then a meaning); ii. 4 (Luke v. 19, not necessarily a removal of the roof, but a letting down in the midst, i.e. over the roof; comp. Matt. ix. 2); vi. 37 (comp. Luke ix. 11, sqq.); iii. 30 (comp. Matt. xii. 24—32).

Peræa are Galilean nobles. Elsewhere, on the other hand, in a smaller number of passages we have to complain of an obscure brevity, and must call in the aid of the two other Gospels. This is the case with the narrative of the temptation, which is but the barren, and in itself obscure and unserviceable outline of the dramatic narrative of Luke, only somewhat strengthened by the addition of the wild beasts, an addition which again is itself obscure; again, the reproof of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi, and the strife among the disciples as to which should be greatest, on the last journey through Galilee, are quite meaningless without the help of the other Gospels; and finally, in the history of the passion, the marks of the writer's impatience to finish his work are accumulated, the words of Jesus in Gethsemane not being carefully weighed, a second passion cry being given without the first, the maltreatment of Jesus with the reed being recorded without a previous mention of the mocking sceptre, and scoffing challenges to prophesy without any mention of the subject about which he was to prophesy. Many singularities in this Gospel, both in general and in detail, are explained by the fact that in it we have a fusion of the different accounts of Matthew and Luke, e.g., the remarkable departure of Jesus from Galilee by night on the morning of the next day, where Matthew has the night and Luke the day; the remarkable appearance of the disciples of John and the Pharisees, where Matthew puts the question in the mouth of the former and Luke of the latter; and the healing of the woman with the issue of blood, which according to Luke was accomplished by touching the garment of Jesus, according to Matthew by the word of Jesus, according to Mark by both. These examples are sufficient.[1] They show that Mark is a subordinate source, which must not be used without extreme caution.

What we have already said also affords so many grounds for refusing to recognize Mark as the author of this Gospel. The

[1] Other examples, Strauss, p. 131.

tradition that it was composed by him, the companion of Peter to Rome, is extremely old, going back to Justin and Papias.[1] John Mark, the Jerusalemite, would be fit for such a rôle as an Israelite by birth, an acquaintance of Peter's in his youth, as well as a later companion of Paul's, with whom he is found in the beginning and at the end of the missions of the latter. His characteristic middle position might have been the result of his intercourse with the two Apostles. But he who in the year 50 is already a prominent assistant of an Apostle, could hardly have been able to write so animated and vigorous a Gospel in the year 100. And if he had been to some extent a witness of the life of Jesus, or even a companion of Peter's, who was an eye-witness of the first order, he would hardly have found it necessary to rely so much upon written sources; and it is improbable, or impossible, that he should have spoken so unfavourably beyond measure of Peter and the Twelve, even with a view to the glorification of Jesus. The tradition concerning Mark betrays itself as untenable by making him the companion of Peter in Rome at the very time when he really stood among the foremost of Paul's assistants, and still more by describing his Gospel as a compilation from the public lectures of Peter at Rome—an impossibility in every respect. Hence we are unacquainted with the Roman author of this book: he has been called Mark because the Roman origin of the book was either known or assumed, and because an assistant of the Apostles who stood connected with Paul, and according to an early tradition (compare 1 Peter iii. 13), also with Peter, appeared to be best adapted to be the transmitter of the correct tradition as well as of that ecclesiastical accommodation of different parties, to which the book itself bears witness.[2]

[1] Justin, *Tryph.* 106 ; Papias, ap. Eus. 3, 39.

[2] The final return of Mark to Peter, which is assumed also by Schenkel (p. 330), is altogether uncertain, and, notwithstanding the vacillations of Mark (must he vacillate to the end?) improbable.

ε.—*The present Controversy.*

Forcible as are the reasons for denying a superior degree of originality to Mark's book, yet the reputation of the Gospel, which Ewald describes as possessing the bright colouring of the fresh flower, is at the present time more flourishing than ever. That province of research known as New Testament introduction has filled a multitude of pages with the controversy concerning Mark, and will fill many more yet. While these preliminary critical inquiries remain incomplete, the possibility of the restoration of a life of Jesus that shall be in any degree credible, seems to be a matter of doubt: our present task is that of allaying to some extent the reader's uneasiness upon this score.

In the first place, the vindicators of Mark have very considerably lowered the pretensions of their assertions. Although many adherents of the Mark-hypothesis—as Ritschl and Volkmar in particular—have attempted to compel belief in the absolute originality of Mark, up to the present time men have become more and more convinced of the untenability of this position. Wilke, the first important representative, discovered a Roman second writer and epitomizer, who could be made responsible for everything that was distasteful; and Ewald, Köstlin, Holtzmann, Schenkel, Reuss, Weiss, and Weizsäcker, have gone further in the same direction. The keen-sighted Schleiermacher found a more strongly-marked modernizing of the Gospel matter in Mark than in Matthew or Luke, and even an approach to the apocryphal characteristic of far-fetched conceits and mysterious performances. This judgment has since been more and more confirmed by the staunchest friends of the book, as can be best seen in the advance from Wilke to Ewald, from Ewald to Holtzmann, from Holtzmann to Weizsäcker; and the "certificate of death" of the Mark-hypothesis—of which Ritschl spoke—is so far lying before us. Weizsäcker has spoken of a greater simplicity in Luke, and of an affected mannerism and unnaturalness in

Mark's descriptions. It were easy to show—and it is partly shown by what is written above—that the critical pruning of Mark's details must be unhesitatingly carried much further. For even the evident perversion of the words of Jesus to the woman of Canaan has been passed over, by Weizsäcker at least, with a light and sparing hand. Indeed, few of Mark's special features as to details would be safe against attack, as we may infer when we duly consider the fate of the more extensively used book of Matthew. The Son of Man's ignorance of the future is also to be found in the best texts of Matthew; the carpenter, instead of the carpenter's son, has a Docetic and apocryphal sound; and the approach of his relations—of which so much has been said—in order to convey him home under the assumption that he was insane, exists only in imagination.[1]

The attempt to throw similar difficulties and the like reproach of omitting what is distasteful in the way of those who defend Matthew's Gospel is, it is hoped, being abandoned. In Matthew, a distinction between the original Gospel and the work of a subsequent hand can be made in only a few very distinctly marked instances; while in Mark the traces of a late date are

[1] xiii. 32, vi. 3 (Origen, *Con. Cels.* 6, 36, has moreover the remark: *οὐδαμοῦ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις φερομένων εὐ. τέκτων αὐτὸς ὁ Ιησοῦς ἀναγέγραπται*); iii. 21 refers, according to the context, simply to the disciples then present, that is, to the company around him in the house. E. Zeller has recently thrown a striking light upon the assumed superiorities of Mark (Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1865, pp. 308 sqq.). In support of my claim for *justice* on behalf of Matthew, I will mention but three facts:—(1) As to Matt. xi. 27, the earliest witnesses (even into the fifth century) assume a different text, and one which alone harmonizes with the context and the tone of thought (contrary to Semisch, *Apost. Denkw. des Märt. Justin's*, 1848, pp. 365, sqq.). (2) In Matt. xxiv. 36, the reading corresponding to Mark xiii. 32 had, on dogmatic grounds, to a great extent disappeared from the MSS., and we Matthewists (comp. Zeller) defended Matthew in that form; now, however, the corroboration of the Vat. and Cant. Bez. by the Sin., has decided in favour of the reading of Mark xiii. 32. (3) In Matt. xxvii. 16 sq., we now find with difficulty a Jesus Barabbas. In this much-read and dogmatically-corrected book there remain still *many late and corrupt alterations*, in contrast with which the undamaged Luke or Mark, or even Paul, seems occasionally to offer an older reading; comp. Matt. v. 32 and xix. 9 (against Luke xvi. 18, Mark x. 11), xix. 17, xxvi. 28, xxviii. 19, fin. On the corruption of the Gospels, comp. Origen *in Matt.* xix. 19; Bleek, *Einl.* pp. 763, sq.

endless and unlimited; the work of the subsequent hand is to be found everywhere, the Gospel nowhere. We are told, however, so much the more emphatically that the superiority of Mark does not reside in the form of its text here or there, but in its general character, in its literary unity and symmetry. The fundamental features of the oldest Gospel, from which all three have drawn materials, have been genuinely and faithfully reflected by Mark alone; while Matthew and Luke, without having actually disclaimed their common parent, have by all kinds of original and borrowed confusing additions so disguised it here and there, that it is not to be recognized. It is therefore easy to explain Matthew and Luke out of Mark, but impossible to explain Mark out of Matthew and Luke. Where, for example, has he concealed their sayings? But this new support, plausible as it is—for brevity is so easily mistaken for conciseness—is as perishable as the bright colouring of the flower. Is it seriously conceivable that the Gospel which in detail is the least trustworthy, because it is the most recent, should as a whole put the others to shame by its faithfulness? Is it probable that the avowedly youngest Gospel should have approached more nearly to the plan of the oldest, than its predecessors, whilst in detail, as every one admits, its writer has purposely made it harmonize with those predecessors? Do not the historical intermediate stages exert an influence in the one respect as in the other? To what desperate assumptions the first false assumption must lead, has been instructively shown by Holtzmann. In his opinion, none of the three Evangelists has made use of the others; an Evangelist may have been acquainted with the other Gospels, Luke in particular with Matthew and Mark, but "in possession of the source"—which Holtzmann "displays" somewhat too rashly—neither needed the other Gospels, had perhaps not money enough to buy or to defray the cost of transcribing them. Wherefore, then, a supplementing of the source by an incessant fresh narration? Wherefore, then, in addition to the most authentic source, a most authentic transcriber, Mark? Whence,

then, the marvel that, notwithstanding all this obstinate independence and purely accidental fresh infusions, one Gospel corresponds to a hair's breadth to the other? No one knows. In the interest of a mechanical explanation, the organic growth of this literature is here lost sight of. The best proof to the contrary is afforded by an examination of the often-mentioned plan. For neither have Matthew and Luke, by the insertion of the "collection of sayings" and other things, by inserting a passage too soon here and too late there, disturbed the plan of the original Gospel; nor has Mark, the imperfect imitator of Luke's artificial arrangement, reproduced it in its purity. The most fatal condemnation of Mark is the gross and complete confusion in the narration of the critical turning-point of the Galilean history at Cæsarea Philippi, a confusion which could have been occasioned only by a dependence at one time on Matthew, at another on Luke.

For the rest, every one may finally believe what he will in this article of faith. The contention is without result for the life of Jesus, so long as the belief in the visibility of the original Gospel is not exaggerated—a belief from which even Holtzmann and Weizsäcker are far enough removed.[1] Suppose we allow that Matthew has inserted the collection of sayings—good; for then the "collection of sayings" also belongs to the apostolic age; and although the original Gospel contained fewer of the legalistic utterances of Jesus—as Weizsäcker unintelligibly thinks possible—and the collection of sayings more, that does not affect the case if only both are "apostolic," as Holtzmann in particular has, with laudable impartiality, declared to be the case with the sayings in Matthew. Suppose we further allow that Mark possesses, more fully than Matthew, the oldest, most authentic order of events of the primitive Gospel—good; for it still

[1] Weizsäcker, p. 52: "None of these (the Synoptics) has quite faithfully, or even nearly literally, reproduced the common source. The relation between Mark and Luke is such, that the latter frequently exhibits a shorter and more primitive text than Mark."

remains that Matthew, in his second division, has followed essentially the same course, and in his first division has departed from the original pattern of perfection chiefly only in the position of the Sermon on the Mount and of the miracles. What does it matter to an intelligent criticism, which is on a level with its subject, whether the Sermon on the Mount and the miracles are placed here or there? The immovable, fundamental fact is, that they stand in the Galilean part of the history, and not in the Judæan; but as to the exactly correct position of the separate details, we are far from being convinced by the fact that Mark says so and so, as if an angel from heaven had spoken to us: we must closely investigate the matter for ourselves, and under certain circumstances, in spite of both Matthew and Mark, must submit to remain in uncertainty.

In these questions it is unnecessary to give way to either controversial heat or despair. The life of Jesus is capable of being reproduced from the Synoptics, whether Matthew or Mark has the predominance. We begin with Matthew; but a just criticism will show itself in the fact that the one Gospel is not overrated, the other not despised.

2.—The Gospel of John.

Luther, as is well known, in his famous Preface to the New Testament, declares himself willing to renounce the three first Gospels, and with them the greater part of the New Testament, in favour of the unique, the tender, the true master-Gospel—the Gospel of John. This Gospel, with the Epistle to the Romans and the first Epistle of Peter, made up a New Testament sufficient for his needs; and he also places SS. Peter and Paul high above the slighted Synoptics, because the latter have reported far too many of the works of Christ, far too little of his sweet, consoling doctrine.[1] To this appreciation of Luther's of what is edifying and sanctifying, there must be added a multitude of

[1] Walch, *Luth. Werke*, 14, p. 104.

other points of view which, from the time of Clement of Alexandria to that of Schleiermacher, have subordinated the poorer Synoptics to the "spiritual Gospel (*dem pneumatischen Evangelium*)," full of spirit, sentiment, yearning and mysticism, and yet at the same time full of energy, sublimity, breadth, variety, and finally of triumph over the perpetuation of Judaism in Christianity.[1] It remained for our century to set aside the verdict of the past. Since the time of Bretschneider and Baur, this Gospel has lost much of its importance, certainly not with reference to its spiritual depth, but with reference to its historical trustworthiness; and the credit which has been abstracted from this book has been given to the previously depreciated Synoptics.[2] It is not surprising that the battle of criticism has been fiercest upon this ground. In prosecuting this intentionally more protracted inquiry, we claim the liberty exercised by Luther, whom we would call the most radical critic of the free Church of the Reformation; and we shall support our conclusions by the admissions of the most faithful defenders of the book itself.

a.—Aim of the Book.

The usual order of procedure must be renounced in this inquiry. It is not so easy here to start from the traces of date. Those traces are not recognized at the first glance; they are intimately bound up with the inmost essence of the work, whilst outward indications of date are wanting; and, in particular, the predictions of Jesus—so helpful in deciding the date of the Synoptics—have altogether disappeared. This indeed is one indication of date: it is easy to understand that a late age altogether renounced sayings which previous times had found it

[1] Clem. Al. ap. Eus. 6, 14: *συνιδόντα, ὅτι τὰ σωματικὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις δεδήλωται,—πνευματικὸν ποιῆσαι εναγγέλιον.*

[2] Bretschneider, *Probabilia de evangelii et epistolarum Joannis ap. indole et origine*, 1820. Baur, *Ueber die Composition und den Character des joh. Evangeliums, Theol. Jahrbb.* 1844. Also *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien*, 1847; and the later treatises in the *Theol. Jahrbb.*

possible to retain only by the aid of artifice and laborious correction, and under a sense of embarrassment; but there came a time when corrections no longer availed. This indication of date will therefore find its place among the others.

Let us, in the meantime, fix our attention upon that passage in the Gospel where the author most distinctly reveals his purpose to later readers, a passage often completely ignored by those who describe the aim of the book.[1] Like Luke, he has declared the aim of his work; but while Luke does this at the beginning, the author of John's Gospel does it at the close. "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in his name."[2] This author, in striking contrast with Luke, disclaims any intention of giving a complete history of Jesus, either as to the miracles and acts, to which he expressly refers, or as to the sayings, so many of which are contained in the other Gospels. He gives only such a selection as shall build up faith, and that which goes hand-in-hand with faith, viz. knowledge, Gnosis, and shall give to this discerning faith life, i. e. joy, blessedness, and fulness of power. Thus his Gospel, regarded with reference to its general characteristics, is, in distinction from others, no mere historical one, but one that is eminently practical, a book of veritable glad tidings, and capable of satisfying the soul's need of salvation, in Luther's sense. It is true that the subject of the book is an historical one—the person of Jesus; and the selection of details, of sayings and acts, is intended to be historical, and is designed to establish conclusively the verdict of faith concerning the historical person of Jesus (in opposition to Gnostic unbelief, as will be afterwards shown), viz., that he is the Christ, or more

[1] We allude here to the critical school as well as to its opponents, *e. g.* Luthardt, *Das johanneische Evangelium nach seiner Eigenthümlichkeit geschildert und erklärt* (1852-53), I. pp. 208 sqq. Credner and Bleek refer to this leading passage.

[2] John xx. 30 sq.

definitely, the Son of God. But the verdict itself, which the history is intended to establish, and which, therefore, underlies the collection of historical extracts, and is plainly enough to be detected there—this verdict is as such no history, but only a more or less warrantable conclusion drawn from the history; and as a subjective conclusion is itself, again, in some sort a product of the practical need which it is the ultimate purpose of the whole Gospel to satisfy. This enables us to form an opinion of Ewald's exaggeration in asserting that the Evangelist has sought to give the purest history.[1]

This avowed aim, which corresponds with that of the first Epistle (i. 3), is in fact clearly and accurately reflected by the whole of the Gospel. We find here nothing more than a gleaning of narratives and sayings, in comparison with all the other Gospels. In the latter, for example, we find nearly twenty detailed narratives of miracles; in John's Gospel, only six. In John's Gospel we miss a number of the most important of the sayings of Jesus, and often find the detailed narration of events suppressed on the supposition that the reader has other sources of information.[2] A close examination makes it evident that the historical narration is directed entirely towards the promotion of faith in Jesus, the Son of God, and in his life-giving power. The selected miracles exhibit his veritably divine majesty, and his sayings are his own continuous testimony to his altogether unique nearness to God; and both sayings and acts establish not only reliance upon his person, but also the certainty of personal divine illumination similar to his, of security, and of the possession of eternal life, in the fellowship of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. This being the supreme aim of the Gospel, it is perfectly intelligible why so much of the history of Jesus

[1] Ewald, *Die joh. Schriften, übersetzt und erklärt.* I. 1861, pp. 2, 7, 14, 33. The Evangelist's most wonderful conscientiousness is here spoken of in superlatives.

[2] Comp. ii. 23, iv. 45, x. 32, xii. 37; particularly also xi. 2. This fragmentary character is recognized also by Godet: *Prüfung der Streitfragen über das 4 Ev.*, translated into German by Wirz, 1866, pp. 4 sqq. Also Ewald and Weizsäcker.

has disappeared; lesser signs are not needed when the greatest speak; the numerous utterances concerning the questions of the Jewish Law, John the Baptist, and even the Christian kingdom of heaven, are not wanted, since in the presence of his person and his personal and ample testimony to himself, all else dwindles into utter insignificance. The history of his childhood and youth has become superfluous, or even questionable; we are concerned with the man who is worthy of our faith, and the story of whose helpless childhood might disturb our belief in the greatness of his nature.[1]

The final purpose of the Gospel, the proclamation of the full greatness and glory of Jesus, or rather the introduction of a higher Christology, which should burst the bonds of the Law and of particularism, was more or less distinctly recognized by the earliest Fathers—e. g. Irenæus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Jerome—though the express declaration at the end received little attention.[2] At the same time, among the numerous chief and subordinate aims of the book, which are recognized, for example, by Ewald, it has been the custom to speak of that of supplementing and perfecting our earlier Gospels. Clement and the author of the Muratorian Fragment have given an elaborate account of the origin of the Gospel that is spiritual (pneumatic), in contrast with those that are more grossly material (somatic). And further, Eusebius has fully and positively treated not only of the doctrinal, but also of the historical improvement and enlargement of the Synoptical Gospels, in which the account of Jesus' first year of teaching is wanting.[3] He has had many followers; and while modern criticism, chiefly in the persons of Credner, Bleek, and Lücke, has altogether abandoned the belief

[1] Instead of giving proofs in detail, we refer the reader only to i. 51, ii. 11.

[2] Comp. Iren. *Hær.* 3, 11, 1: Volens auferre eum, qui a Cerintho inseminatus erat hominibus, errorem. Very particularly also Jerome in *Proœm Mt.: Coactus est de divinitate salvatoris altius scribere.* Comp. Credner, *Einl.* pp. 237 sqq.

[3] Clem. ap. Eus. 6, 14. Eus. himself, *Hist. Ec.* 3, 24. The followers of Eusebius, comp. Credner, *Einl.* pp. 248 sq.

that this Gospel was intended to be a supplement to the others, Ewald, Weizsäcker, and Godet, have of late fallen back upon this belief, and have defended it with much energy. In the intelligible and indisputable sense that the writer sought to supply a want which he found unsatisfied by the existing Gospels, the completion theory must of course be admitted; but as soon as we go further, and from a few marked deviations from the Synoptics seek to deduce a general attempt at an historical correction of his predecessors, we not only lose ourselves among passages which do not ask for this explanation, but we sin against the spirit of the whole book, for the book has taken no account whatever of trifles, but has boldly and regardlessly admitted the widest deviations from the three Gospels, without a trace of explanation, apology, or accusation. The author is really much greater than he is generally held to be; he seeks to win men's minds, not by the detailed exactness of the external history, but by the spirit of that history: the externals, the details, are to him (as Weizsäcker also sees) only means, symbols, landscape and figures, the material (somatic) basis upon which is erected the spiritual (pneumatic) building of that loftier world of ideas which alone can satisfy our religious aspirations.[1]

In order to discover the aim of this book, it is more appropriate and serviceable to ask, For whom did the Evangelist write? This question receives a partial answer from his own declaration: "These things are written that ye may believe, and believing may have life in his name." Those whom he addresses are simply the Christian community, by no means either Jews or (as Hilgenfeld thinks) Gentiles, who were yet to be converted.[2] It is true, the expression would allow of this latter meaning; but,

[1] Thus iii. 24 is not a correction of the Synoptics, but only a justification of the introduction of John; and in ii. 11, iv. 54, we have simply a fanciful reckoning, without any reference to the Synoptics.

[2] Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien*, 1854, p. 249: Address to the cultivated consciousness of the Gentile world.

in the first place, the Gospels were, as Luke shows, written almost exclusively for Christians; and, in the next place, it is evident that the author always assumes the reader's acquaintance with the life of Jesus, and that he concerns himself essentially with the propagation of a higher estimate of Jesus, and occasionally with the belief in some hitherto unknown but striking evidence of his divinity.[1] We may add to this, that the first Epistle of John, which inculcates the same ideas in another, that is, in a polemic form, is throughout addressed to Christians. We may say simply that, in comparison with the elementary Gospels, this is the full Gospel for those that are perfect.[2] So much is correct among the incorrect assertions of the Fathers, and recently of Ewald, who is of opinion that John wrote especially for intimate friends—the narrow circle of the Ephesian presbyters. The whole truth is, that the Evangelist wrote for the one general Christian community, consisting of both Jewish and Gentile Christians. Recently (by Godet, among others) attention has been fixed chiefly upon Gentile Christian readers. This view is supported, in fact, by the designation of the Jews as "Jews," the explanation of Jewish names and customs, the rejection of the nation, even of the Law, and the solemn and repeated proclamation of the calling of the Gentiles. On the other hand, the Christ of this Gospel has sheep belonging to both folds; and in the midst of the final rejection of the nation, the Evangelist mentions the fact that many have believed. Moreover, the author has carefully preserved the connection with the Old Testament, and has brought Christianity itself under the conciliatory conception of a new commandment. Thus it is the universal Church—not, indeed, the church of Luthardt which knows of no distinctions, but the Church which possesses a unity built upon a duality—to which he speaks, and the fusion

[1] Comp. xi. 2, xix. 35.

[2] Clem. ap. Eus. 6, 14: πνευματικόν. Muratorian Fragment in Credner, *Gesch. des N. T. Canon*, ed. Volkmar, 1860, p. 154: Ut recognoscentibus *cunctis* Johannes suo nomine *cuncta* describeret.

of which he himself would help to complete in a fresh way, viz., not only by confessing the predominance of Gentile Christianity in the Church, but also by recognizing that predominance as divinely ordained on account of the Jewish national hardness of heart.[1] In this aim he is in harmony with both Luke and Mark; and we express this generally by saying, that in his distinct assertion of universalism and of freedom from the Law, he is the perfecter of Luke, while in the sublimity of his Christology and in his demand for unity and a higher legalism in the Church, he is more particularly a follower of Mark.

β.—Dogmatic Character.

No Gospel, in a certain sense no book in the New Testament, has such a rich and strongly-marked doctrinal character as the Gospel of John. Its details are arranged in the setting of a comprehensive view of the world, in fact of a great philosophy of religion; and no phenomenon in the Gospel is more distinctly characteristic than this.

Between God and the world there exists a complete contradiction. God is invisible, formless, voiceless, pure spirit; the world is visible, material, flesh and blood, the subject of passions; He is life and light, the world is lifeless darkness. But this infinite contradiction has its mediator, the Logos, the Word of God that was from the beginning, is in the direction towards God (*in der Richtung auf Gott* [πρὸς τὸν θεόν]), is itself God, essential life, essential light. By this Logos everything in the world was made; without him was not anything made; his light of life enlightens men, shines in the darkness, but the dark world has not appropriated it.[2]

Hence the true light was continually coming into the world,

[1] Comp. the closing reflections, xii. 37 sqq.

[2] See especially i. 1 sqq. I refrain from giving here a complete list of the well-known passages. Comp. the views on the doctrine of the book by Frommann, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, Weiss. Unfortunately, the historical position of the doctrine has been hitherto either insufficiently set forth (Weiss, 1862, has done nothing whatever in that direction), or in a one-sided manner, as by Hilgenfeld (1849).

which world was its property, that it had itself created. But the world did not perceive the Logos, did not accept him. This is a resistance on the part of man's free will, and flows from Satan into the world of mankind, but has its ultimate root in desire, in the lust of flesh and blood—finally, in the gloomy soil of the world. Only a few received him, admitted the light, and became thereby endowed with the Divine nature, instead of that of the flesh. Those born of God do not belong merely to Israel, for the revelation of the Logos is, above all, a universal one; all men are the "property" of the Logos, and children of God flow to Jesus from the whole world. Undoubtedly Israel, "the nation" (xi. 52), has enjoyed the clearest light; Judaism alone rightly understands what it worships, the true God; salvation is of the Jews, Moses and the prophets have foretold of Christ, and he who believes Moses must also believe in Christ. But the Jews have not rightly believed Moses, for they have perversely set all their hopes on him, thinking to find life in the Old Testament, while in fact Moses had offered them only the Law, but not grace and truth; material worship, but not a real revelation of God, merely an obsolete religion, "*your Law.*"[1]

Therefore the Logos takes a third and decisive step into the world which lies out of God and in the flesh. The Logos himself becomes flesh, dwells among men in a fleshly tabernacle, a present God in the glory of the Only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. We are not told how, in renouncing the fulness of divine glory, he added the human to the divine, the creature to the creator; nothing is said of the transition, of his human birth, and at every point in his life there is a conflict between his divine exaltation and his human abasement: yet the two are ever there, and in the person of Jesus the world hails the Son of God and the Son of Man. Although he has forsaken heaven and the glory of heaven, he not only lives in full recollection of that past which was before Abraham and before the foundation of the world, but he is continually, as he himself

[1] Comp. i. 17 sq., iv. 23, v. 37, 38, 45, viii. 17, x. 34.

says, one with the Father, is ever in heaven, diffuses rays of divine glory, makes God visible to the world of mankind, knows all things divine and human, knows the hearts of men. Though the whole world fails to understand him, he surveys his whole course from the beginning, and foresees every part of his task,—his rising superior to Judaism, his call of the Gentiles, his cross and his return home. He works creative miracles, paralyzes his enemies, and snatches himself from their fury, until his hour comes, and his own word gives the signal for bonds and sufferings. These bonds and sufferings are accompanied by a new revelation of divine glory (xii. 28); in truth, he appears to owe to them his highest triumph, and he passes through them as a purely voluntary sufferer, as a conqueror over death, immediately and for ever exalted to be with the Father.[1] By the side of all this there are truly human features: he hungers, thirsts, is weary, his soul is the subject of human anguish, he is sad and joyous, like a man he learns from God in matters of knowledge and obedience, and receives from God strength to teach and to work miracles.[2] The characteristic dualism which is here placed before us, found its explanation in the author's mind chiefly in the necessity of seriously contemplating in Christ a double existence, higher and lower, heavenly and earthly, spirit and flesh, nay, the entrance of God into flesh; and the author was prevented by the spirit of the age from detecting the violence of the contrast in this dualism, since he not only brought the divine Logos more completely within the sphere of the dependent condition of human nature than is consistent with our ideas, and could therefore easily set the Logos and the human mind of Jesus in juxtaposition, but he even derived an innocent pleasure from studying the intricate play of the contradictions between the infinite and the finite, between freedom and the restraints imposed by the limitations of nature.

[1] Comp. i. 18, iii. 13, x. 18, xvii. 11; and again, i. 18, iii. 13. Godet, p. 30: "Is this the Christ of the Docetæ?" Answer: To some extent.

[2] Comp. only v. 19, 30 sqq.

The essential office of the incarnate Logos was to set forth and to give to the world, in his own person, the glory of God.[1] This he does by the exhibition of himself,—for in him the world sees the Father; by his teaching,—for he, the apostle, exegete, and paraclete of God, offers the whole truth concerning God and him whom God has sent, and with this truth the fulness of consoling grace and the streams of eternal life. He does it by his acts,—for in his miracles the divine life illuminates the world; and in his cross and resurrection, the victory of light and life and love, the entrance of divine life into men, into the great masses of mankind, is abundantly effected.[2] His coming is of efficacy for all men, and his death is the seed-corn, the ripe fruit of which is a universal church,—a church comprehending both Jews and Gentiles. Whoever sees him, hears him, confesses and believes in him, keeps his new commandment of love to God and to his brother man—the end of all obedience to the Law—has eternal life, joy, perfect satisfaction, uninterrupted oneness with him, through death and beyond death in heaven. But the work of the Incarnate is limited by the darkness of the world. He calls all, but only some hear him, while others hate him. On one side are the children of God; on the other, the children of the world, of darkness, of the devil, and on this side are the masses of the Jewish people. The ultimate ground of this distinction is the will of God himself,—God chooses and draws some, and hardens the hearts of others; and it is divinely appointed that Christ, chiefly in the death which the world inflicts upon him, should pass the decisive sentence upon good and bad, the devil and the world, and should intensify and perpetuate the dark shadows of the world which are massed together in Jerusalem, and with those shadows the wrath of God.[3]

In this way the departure of Jesus introduces a fourth, the mightiest and at the same time the subtlest, influx of light into

[1] Comp. xvii. 2, 6, xiv. 9, viii. 40, 47.

[2] Apostle, xvii. 18; Exegete, i. 18; Paraclete, xiv. 16.

[3] Comp. iii. 20 sqq., viii. 43 sqq., xi. 52, xii. 31, 39.

the world and into the midst of the resistant darkness of the world. This is the advent of the Spirit, the other comforter. He comes forth from the Father, a new bearer of divine power to the otherwise orphaned disciples; yet is the Son also the sender, is indeed the dispenser of the Spirit as he departs from earth, for what is the Father's is also his; it is even he himself—the Son—who comes, for the Spirit partakes of his nature and enters into his work.[1] The Spirit is a yet higher blessing than the Son; and the departure of Jesus is profitable to the disciples, since so only can the Spirit come. His coming is unseen, yet he is more intimately united with the men whom Jesus guarded only from without; he is with them, in them, yet without depriving them of their personality, or of their own consciousness.[2] He recalls everything to their remembrance, teaches them everything, discloses the truth without parable, reveals the future, leaves no question unanswered, brings consolation, empowers them to work yet greater miracles and to offer up independent prayer, raises them to equality with the Son, their friend; he thoroughly interweaves heaven and earth, for a single stream of divine life flows at once through the Church and the Godhead, and Father and Son in the fellowship of the Spirit take up their abode in the Church and diffuse joy without measure or end, so that heaven itself will be merely the prolongation of the blessedness of earth.[3] This new and supreme indwelling of God in the world is not without illuminating and elevating power for the world itself. Through the Spirit, the disciples will win new believers; and from the contemplation of the sacred immanence—Christ in the united and perfect Church, God in Christ—the world shall see that God sent Jesus and loved the Church as he loved the Son.[4] But the eternal

[1] Comp. xiv. 16, 26, 28, xv. 26, xvi. 4, 15, 22, xx. 22.

[2] Comp. xiv. 17, xv. 26 sq., xvii. 12.

[3] xiv. 10 sqq., 20, 23, xvi. 23, 25, xvii. 10 sqq., 21, 23. Friend, xv. 14—19, xvi. 27. Comp. the title, "Friend of God," in Philo, *Leg. all.* 98; *Resip. Noe*, 281. Also James ii. 23; Credner, *Einl.* p. 603.

[4] xvii. 20 sqq.

antagonism will not cease. The Lord's disciples are not "of the world," not of the evil one; and the last high-priestly prayer of Jesus does not intercede for the world. The world neither knows nor discerns the Spirit, and the highest and last work of the Spirit in the world is concerned with the conviction of sin and the severity of final judgment.[1]

Nothing is plainer than that, in this last life of Jesus, there is a strong infusion of a lofty philosophic conviction. We have here a late and elaborate dogmatism, and Jesus himself is converted into the subtlest of dogmatists. Many theologians, even up to the present day, take a great deal of trouble to find no philosophy in this Gospel, and to explain the perplexing word Logos either as a mere personification of the chief minister of the word of God, or as only a continuation of Old Testament speculation concerning the creative word and the active wisdom of God. Several recent writers, as Luthardt and Weiss, reasoning from unsound and sophistical premises, deny the dependence of the Gospel upon the ideas of the age, and are overjoyed to hear from Herr Hölemann, of Leipzic, the assurance that the Logos of John and that of the Alexandrians have nothing in common. But such writers are only indulging in puerilities and perversities of which advancing science can no longer take note.[2] It is a fact supported by the clearest evidence, and hence recognized not merely by Bretschneider, Baur, and Baumgarten-Crusius, but also more or less openly by Lücke, Bleek, Schmid, Weizsäcker and others, that the Johannine Gospel owes its existence to the union of the life of Jesus with that Alexandrian Philonic philosophy of religion which, fifty years earlier, had made it possible for the Apostle Paul to construct the edifice of

[1] xvi. 8 sqq., xvii. 9, 14.

[2] Luthardt (I. p. 201) quite frankly gives the ground of his opinion by appealing to Carpzov (against Mangey, 1749): Scripsisset Johannes ita omnino, si vel nullus etiam Plato aut Philo nullus unquam aliquid de λόγῳ exposuissent, &c. Nor has the question any further interest for Weiss (p. 251), who appeals to Hölemann, *De Ev. Joannis introitu*, 1855, in support of the refusal to recognize the influence of Philo.

his dogmatic teaching.[1] And the Philonic system — which will be examined further on—is seen supporting not only, as has been hitherto supposed, the idea of the Logos, but also a complete view of the world.[2] In John's Gospel, as in Philo, there is the abstract idea of God,—God as pure spirit, without body, without form and invisible, higher than the highest name, not even to be spoken of as light, simply existing as the One and as active. The intermediate nature is the Logos, word and reason, the first-born, the only-begotten, the image of God, the beginning, the instrument by which the world was made, the ambassador, the plenipotentiary, the interpreter, the imitator of the divine prototypes, the judge, the prince, the shepherd, the dispenser of food, the intercessor, the high-priest, the comforter. The Logos introduces the divine seed into the darkness and wild turmoil of matter; his noblest work is man, whose immortal, nay, pre-existent spirit (comp. John ix. 1, 2) he illuminates, while, it is true, the perfect type, the immaterial man, exists only in heaven, and the earthly man is led captive by the sensuality of the flesh, in lust, and sin and death. Man can, however, withdraw himself from the sensuous world, from which he is freed by death; he can enjoy the indwelling of the Spirit, but only with God, who draws His own whom He has elected before their birth. They are then taught of God, their spirits are the temple of God, they are free, kings, children of God, and do not even need the guidance of the Logos, with whom finally they keep pace. Both Gentiles and Jews enjoy the blessings conferred by this Logos, and become children and friends of God. It is true that the Gentile philosophers have not seen God as

[1] Weizsäcker, p. 242, prudently says: "We are not required here to examine further as to what historical connection exists between these ideas and pre-Christian philosophy."

[2] Comp. below, the historical exhibition of the system of Philo and the literature concerning him; but the reader may previously refer to the extracts from the doctrine of the Logos given, *e.g.*, by De Wette, *Bibl. Dogmatik*, 3rd ed., pp. 128 sqq. First recognition of this connection in Mangey, *Phil. opp.*, 1742, and Ballenstedt, *Philo und Johannes*, 1802.

clearly as have Moses and the Jews, who indeed have seen no divine form; yet they have seen the Highest himself, and have worshipped Him under material images adapted to the bodily eye, but having a spiritual significance to the philosopher.

Who—notwithstanding the traces of other influences impressed upon this book—would deny the independent position of the Christian author that first detected in the living Christ and in the living Spirit of the Christian community the abstract ideas which Philo had attached to the illustrious historical name of Moses; and thereby gave to those ideas life and reality, and freed them, up to a certain point, from the harsh contradictions of a sharply-defined dualism? The Logos, in Philo only an intermediate being which in the act of manifestation is ever passing again out of sight, and the heavenly man, in Philo only a heavenly ideal image, become, in John's Gospel, one incarnate personality. This Logos, in Philo ever coyly retreating before contact with "corporeal needs," in John's Gospel has allowed nothing in the world to come into existence without his agency, has boldly taken upon himself human flesh, and in the flesh has given forth light, has wrought and suffered; with him, his believing followers have overcome their fear of the material world, have not fled from the things of earth, have not sought death, have only guarded themselves against the spiritual world, and, superior to the world, have celebrated the joyous festivals of perfect union with God, who, in no mere compassionate figure of speech, has called them his children.[1] It was Christianity that filled old forms with a new spirit; and it was Christianity that burst these old forms, and either left them as they were or built them up afresh. It is important to consider how much it behoves the present age to lay aside these old forms, even the

[1] First, of the highest God: *τὸ πρὸς θεὸν ζωῆς γένος οὐ κατέβη πρὸς ἡμᾶς οὐδὲ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰς σώματος ἀνάγκας* (*Q. rer. div. haer.* p. 487). Of the Logos: *ὁ ὑπεράνω πάντων λόγος εἰς ὁρατὴν οὐκ ἦλθεν ἰδέαν, ἅτε μηδενὶ τῶν κατ' αἴσθησιν ἐμφερὴς ὤν* (*D. profug.* 465). Even the conception of the fatherhood of God is regarded as anthropomorphic and anthropopathic (*Q. Deus sit immut.* 301).

old forms of this Christ, and to acknowledge that the Christ who was moulded by, and who taught according to, these forms, is not a perfectly faithful expression of the Jesus of history.

γ.—*The Form.*

The fundamental division of this Gospel was recognized as early as the days of Eichhorn. It is plainly at the close of the twelfth chapter, where Jesus breaks off his testimony in Jerusalem, and the Evangelist, with a solemn glance at the past, discloses the grounds of the Jewish unbelief which stands prepared to put the holy one to death. With equal solemnity, the thirteenth chapter introduces the last hours of Jesus by the beaming forth of his love at the parting supper. Thus, in this Gospel also, the life and the passion are separated; the old main division is retained, but the period of the passion is made to begin later: in Matthew and Mark it begins at Cæsarea; in Luke, a little later, with the journey to death; while in John it begins on the eve of the Passover. The points of view which underlie the two parts are also in evident agreement with the earlier Evangelists, only, in proportion as they are modified by the fundamental conception of the author, they present themselves before the reader in sharper and more impressive relief: what is described is the glory of Jesus Christ as it more and more fully reveals itself, both in life and death, in its struggle with darkness. The sub-divisions—about which there is greater difference of opinion, and concerning which Baur's views are the most striking, if not the most accurate—are again nothing more than the steps and stages of a history which in essence is a development, a progress, the drama of a growing manifestation of glory with growing effects and consequences, and of a growing embitterment of the powers of darkness.[1] After the religio-philoso-

[1] Formerly the feasts and journeys were used as dividing-points, and Ewald has again thus used the latter, although he explains that such external dividing-points—especially days and feasts—are not in themselves satisfactory (p. 15), and here and

phical preface, the first part shows, in its first act, the introduction of the Son of God by John, who, a prophetic teacher, finally retiring as the moon before the sun, gives the whole perspective of the future belief and unbelief (ch. i.—iii.). The second act shows Jesus' increasing activity, especially outside of Jerusalem; but also the growing storm which arises in Jerusalem after the healing of the paralytic, as well as the storm in Galilee, which district longs for an earthly Messiah and cannot understand the Messiah of the Passover (ch. iv.—vi.). The third and last act gives the completion of the testimony and controversies in Judæa and Jerusalem; and to the latter place Jesus, with significant allusions to his hour and his Passover, now betakes himself for the last time. His testimony rises higher and higher, till it reaches the declaration of his existence before Abraham, and of his perfect oneness with God; his miracles become increasingly startling, until he raises to life a dead man in whom decay has set in; his attacks grow sharper and sharper, until he reproaches the Jews with being the children of the devil, while they on their part call him the child of the devil, and raise violent hands against him (ch. vii.—xii.). This introduces the second main division, the three acts of which are easily distinguishable: first, the farewell addresses (ch. xiii.—xvii.); then the actual catastrophe (ch. xviii.—xix.); and, finally, the glory of the resurrection (ch. xx.). The lesser and most minute articulations of the delicate organism of the book may be here passed over; yet it is worth while to notice that the arrangement in triplets, which underlies the plan of the Gospel, is carried with artistic skill, and even mysteriously, into its most minute and delicate veins, and is not merely a Hebraism, but undoubtedly rests upon the absolute ground of the divine mystery of the Trinity. Thrice is Jesus in Galilee, thrice in Judæa, twice three feasts take place

there he is obliged to postulate the existence of "gaps." Those who have adopted the classification based on the internal matter of the history have—especially Baur—always regarded vii. 1 as marking a crisis; on the other hand, they have thrown iii.—vi. together, overlooking the crisis at iii. 27—iv. 1.

during his ministry, and particularly three Passover feasts—in the beginning, the middle and the end—which either foretell or procure his death. He works three miracles in Galilee, and three in Jerusalem.[1] Twice three days is he in the neighbourhood of John, three days are covered by the narrative of Lazarus, six by the fatal Passover; he utters three sayings on the cross, and appears thrice after his resurrection.

The style of the book is a remarkable compound of genuine Greek facility and skill, with Hebrew forms of expression marked by simplicity, childlikeness, metaphor, and also awkwardness: thus the union of conflicting party opinions is embodied in the very language.[2] The composition reveals an artist who gives nature, even where all is design. There is no ornament, no inflated rhetoric, as in Mark. Everything is as simple and liquid as in real life; there is a natural play in the sequence of events; but the subtle art of the writer is self-betrayed in the care which is bestowed on the progress of the history from one incident to another, and in the slight and fugitive touches out of which to the thoughtful reader a whole picture develops itself, as, e.g., in the rich description of a landscape, of the scene of the conversation between Jesus and the Samaritan woman, or again in Bethany, where the reader needs no painter, and the painter no invention. To this picturesqueness is added a system of profound thought, which harmonizes with the former, because it finds ready expression in imagery, and is made familiar and intelligible to the hearer by being given forth with prudent reserve; but which, however, on the other hand, derives from the contrast between the thought and the imagery a marvellous power of stirring the mind and arresting the attention. Beneath it all, lurk everywhere mysteries concerning a most mysterious personality, concerning most mysterious antagonisms; obscure

[1] In Galilee: the miracle at Cana, the ruler, the miracle of feeding (the occurrence on the lake is a pure addition); at Jerusalem: the paralytic, the man born blind, Lazarus. It is remarkable that the number and arrangement have not, as a rule, been noticed (Credner, indeed, speaks, p. 241, of five miracles).

[2] Comp. Godet, l. c., pp. 20 sqq., 22: the clothing Greek, the body Hebrew.

sayings, obscure deeds, explained only by their results, the deeds themselves transparent pictures of thought—as Herder remarked—mere varying signs and symbols, of the literalness of whose meaning one would remain as uncertain as of the religio-historical symbolism of the conversation with the Samaritan woman, did not the author himself insist upon that literalness; even that which is apparently accidental and involuntary—the day, the series of days, the series of feasts, of journeys, of miracles—is full of meaning, of spirit, of symbol.[1] Side by side with the mysterious stands the reverse of the picture: the Jews, the Samaritans, the disciples, do not understand the Lord. Sometimes they speak with all the ludicrousness of uncultured men; sometimes they misunderstand him with an unhappy absurdity of which we are seldom guilty in our intercourse with each other; and sometimes, becoming in their misunderstanding involuntarily correct prophets of the truth, they themselves, as in a magic circle, heighten the impression of mystery, become themselves a mystery.[2] Finally, as to the tone of mind in which the Gospel is written. Here we have rest and harmony—as in the imagery—peace, joy and blessedness, such as the Christian seeks for; and though struggle is not wanting, varied and intense—heat, want, trouble, zeal, anger, irony—yet the struggling Christ is a part of the Christian life which seeks to find expression in him; and Christ's *finale*, at the parting supper, on the cross, after the resurrection, is peace, victory, glory.

This is the charm in the *form* of the Gospel, which completes the victory of its subject, i.e. the superhuman, but nevertheless human person of Jesus—the deliverer from sin and death and the world, from the Law and the nation, from heaven and earth.

[1] To every one with eyes, the interview with the Samaritan woman has a purely symbolical significance, and cannot rest upon any historical fact. The five husbands of the Samaritan woman are the five religions which the Samaritan settlers brought out of Asia; and the sixth is the pseudo-Jehovah whom the Samaritans then worshipped: all according to 2 Kings xvii. 24 sqq.; Jos. *Ant.* 9, 14, 3. Meyer sees nothing when he asks, Where then is the sixth?

[2] Comp. only vii. 35, 42, xi. 48, 50.

We refer the reader to Strauss's able description.[1] Yet everything has its limits. To say nothing of the fact that the enigma is often exaggerated, and that which the mind can grasp passes over into its opposite, there is in this Gospel a characteristic feature of leaden monotony, the displeasing impression of which is concealed under so many other impressions that are favourable, yet is not to be disputed, and has recently been admitted by Weizsäcker among others. But the fault—as in the case of the enigma—lies in the subject itself. The Christ who is perfect from the beginning, who knows all, does all, dares all, whose chief work is that of bearing constant and most unreserved testimony to himself, and of bringing to light the ever deadly enmity of the world of darkness, who moreover finds, not only in the Evangelist, but also in John his forerunner, a constant echo of all his sayings—he, according to this conception of him, is a Christ that both in history and in the hands of the ablest author, is an immovable, dead, monotonous figure, which, in spite of all progression in the narrative, is from the beginning already defunct, and can only be with difficulty preserved to the end artificially, by means of a series of gradations in the cries and in the conflicts, or by means of fresh scenery, as in the closing incidents at Jerusalem.

δ.—*The Sources.*

The question as to the historical character of the matter and form of this Gospel comes back upon us with ever-increasing urgency; but before we decide, perhaps negatively, we must examine whether the author has based his peculiar achievements on any sources, and what they are.

Formerly, Lücke considered the employment of the Synoptics by John very problematical; but Bleek and De Wette showed a strong inclination to reverse the relations between John and

[1] Pp. 142 sqq.

Luke and Mark at least, and to believe in the dependence of these two upon John. Recently, however (justified, we may say, by the earliest testimony), nearly every one (Baur, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Godet, Hengstenberg, Luthardt, Weizsäcker) admits that the Synoptics were at the command of the author of John's Gospel, and even supplied him with a foundation for his own work.[1] It is a proof of this that he aims at adding only a last word to the Gospels already read in the Church; a further proof is seen in his retaining the fundamental arrangement of the old Gospels (Galilee, Jerusalem, the ministry, the passion, and, in a certain sense, a Galilean commencement of the passion), as well as a great number of short, incisive sayings—which do not appear to be much enlarged—many narratives and the majority of the miracles; and yet another proof is to be found in several passages—especially in the remark about John's imprisonment (iii. 24)—in the writer's explanatory correction of some existing tradition referred to by our Synoptics.

We are reminded of Matthew in particular, not only by the numerous sayings collected by Baur, but also by the honourable mention of Peter, by the meek animal on which Jesus rode, the sword-scene in Gethsemane, Mary at the grave, the ruler's son, and other things. Many things are suggestive of the later Gospels, especially Luke. For example, the anointing by Mary, the service of Martha, the smiting off the right ear with a sword in Gethsemane, the incidents connected with Peter in the hall, the three languages written on the cross, the new grave, the two angels and Peter at the grave, the prints of the nails, the touching the wounds, the impartation (instead of the mere promise) of the Spirit, the—at least, assumed—ascension.[2] Further, the

[1] Lücke, *Comm. über das Ev. des Johannes*, 3rd ed., 1840, I. 197: "The employment of the Synoptics is very problematical." On the other hand, Weizsäcker, p. 270: "The synoptical account forms the background upon which the particular form of the fourth Gospel is drawn." Godet, p. 94.

[2] The three languages on the cross are, it is true, not universally found in Luke xxiii. 38, but they are strongly supported by Sin., and can hardly have been borrowed from John, who gives them in a reversed and incorrect order (John xix. 20). Ascension, vi. 62.

partiality shown towards the Samaritan ministry, with a view to the later Samaritan church as seen in the Acts of the Apostles; and finally and chiefly, the mysterious character of the life of Jesus, his miraculous knowledge, his miraculous escape, his temptation by the devil in his passion, and the entering of the devil into Judas, one of the twelve. An acquaintance with Mark's Gospel is suggested by the two hundred pennyworth of bread at the miracle of the loaves, the walking of Jesus on the sea, and the description of the ointment as being worth three hundred pence; and in general by the "new" doctrine, the equality of Jews and Gentiles, the higher legalism, and notably again by the mysteriousness of the person of Jesus and the increasing misunderstanding of him by men, even by the disciples, the reticence with reference to miracles, the manipulations connected with the miracles, the general atmosphere of incomprehensibility, Jesus' indifference about food, his heroism, and his hiding himself.[1] That, in these points of contact, the dependence is on the side of the fourth Gospel, and not of the other Gospels, is made conspicuously evident by the amplifying touches introduced by the former. Thus the disciple who used his sword in Gethsemane, and who is not named by Luke, has become in the fourth Gospel Peter, and the man who was smitten, Malchus; the disciple who, in Mark, counted the loaves at the miracle of feeding the multitudes, has become Philip, and the indignant disciple at the supper at Bethany, Judas—names which Luke and Mark would certainly not have withheld if they had been at their command. Nor can it be believed that Luke would have failed to note the manner of the devil's entering into Judas, if he had had access to the drastic description of the fourth Gospel.

With all this minute and detailed borrowing, it is nevertheless true that the writer of the fourth Gospel has taken great liberties with his synoptical predecessors. While he has sought

[1] Comp. also Strauss, p. 135.

continually to retain in some way their facts and their tone of feeling, he has not shrunk from introducing, in the most important as well as in the most trivial matters, a hundred deviations which had their excuse in their consistency and novelty. Especially has he taken great liberties with the sayings of Jesus; the arrangement of these sayings was, however, also somewhat various in the other Gospels. The saying against the love of life makes its appearance at Jerusalem on the occasion of the visit of the Greeks to the feast; the saying concerning the servant's relation to his master, at the washing of the disciples' feet; the prediction of persecution, in the farewell addresses. The saying about the prophet in his own country is quite incidentally alluded to, and the suspicion—contemporary with this saying—against the man who had never learned, is transferred to the temple at Jerusalem.[1] But the narratives also are placed in a different order: the purifying of the temple, the saying about its destruction, the naming of Peter, come at the beginning instead of at the end; the healing of the paralytic occurs at Jerusalem, the agony of Jesus in the city, not in Gethsemane; the address belonging to the last supper is spoken in Galilee instead of at the end of the last days in Jerusalem. An internal transformation is also frequently noticeable. The most modest is the mention of names elsewhere wanting, in one place Andrew and Philip, in another Peter and John, in another Judas, in another Mary and Martha, and in yet another Malchus. Then, again, there is the portrayal, with heightened colour and yet with well-kept proportions, of double-conflicts—as when the Sabbath controversies of the previous Gospels are coupled with the great miracles of the healing of the paralytic and the man born blind. But how much more artificial, and even mythical and objectionable, are the narratives of the ruler (the centurion), the paralytic, and the walking on the sea—the latter ending not with the mere calm-

[1] xii. 25, xiii. 16, xv. 20, xvi. 1, iv. 44, vii. 15.

ing of the waters, but with the fabulously sudden arrival at the shore![1] In some instances we find that an allusion of the earlier Gospels has grown into a graphic and lengthy narrative. Those earlier Gospels apply to the Baptist the words of the prophet, "the voice of one crying in the wilderness," but in the fourth Gospel it has become the Baptist's own assertion; Luke represents him as disclaiming the Messiahship, but in the fourth Gospel this has become a subject of negociation between him and the Sanhedrim. Luke, the friend of the Gentiles, relates, in opposition to what really happened, a final journey through Samaria, and gives several intimations of the existence of a Samaritan belief; the fourth Gospel knows of a mission to the Samaritans from the very beginning, of the conquest of the capital city, while in the perspective lies the conversion of the whole land. Luke gives the utterance of Jesus, on the last sacred evening, concerning his serving the disciples who were at table with him; the narrative of the washing of the disciples' feet has been developed out of this in the fourth Gospel.[2] Luke also gives the parable of the poor man Lazarus, who after death attains to life and glory; and to the parable is added a reference to the unbelief of Israel, which even a most distinctly visible resurrection from the dead would not overcome; the fourth Gospel knows of a resurrection of Lazarus, the last and greatest miracle, which instead of breaking down the national unbelief, only provokes it to violence.[3]

Other Christian sources cannot be detected in this Gospel, with satisfactory certainty, or to any considerable amount. The writer was most probably acquainted with the Gospel of the Hebrews. For proof of this, we must not place much reliance on the narrative of the adulteress (viii. 1, &c.), for this narrative can be shown to be a later interpolation, though it certainly exhibits

[1] iv. 46 sqq. (comp. Matt. viii. 5 sqq.), v. 1 sqq. (Matt. ix. 1 sqq.), vi. 16 sqq. (Matt. xiv. 22 sqq.).

[2] Comp. Luke xxii. 24 sqq.

[3] Luke xvi. 19 sqq. and John xi. 1 sqq.

some resemblance to the story of a sinful woman related by Papias, and referred by Eusebius to the Gospel of the Hebrews.[1] But the saying about the necessity of being born from above, contained in the conversation with Nicodemus, very distinctly suggests the existence of such an original form as has not been preserved anywhere in our earlier Gospels, but is contained in the quotations concerning the new birth borrowed, most probably from the Gospel of the Hebrews, by Justin and the Clementine Homilies.[2] No stress is to be laid upon an occasional resemblance to the later Gospel of the Ebionites.[3] Credner has already pointed out the manifold resemblance of the fundamental conceptions in John's Gospel with the Preaching of Peter that made its appearance at the beginning of the second century. Other resemblances to the Epistle to the Hebrews, the first Epistle of Peter, and particularly to the Epistle of Barnabas, can be easily detected.[4] There remains open only the question as to the side on which dependence lies; and upon this point we have no doubt that the work nearest to the Gospel of John—the Epistle of Barnabas—is to be reckoned among the witnesses to this Gospel—among which Justin the Martyr is also to be reckoned—although it has been recently regarded by Volkmar as a work that prepared the way for John.

The inquiry into the sources of this Gospel leaves us, after all, at a loss to explain the startling novelties and bold deviations of the book. Does the living stream of oral tradition, or the having been an eye-witness, excuse or justify the author; or must we, upon many points, abide by the belief that he gave

[1] Eus. 3, 39.

[2] Just., *Ap.* I. 94. Clem., *Hom.* xi. 26.

[3] I mean the reference of Jesus to his choice of the twelve apostles, vi. 70, xv. 16, 19; comp. Gospel of the Ebionites, *αὐτὸς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς.—ἐξελεξάμην Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον.* But similarly, Luke vi. 13. *Ker. Petr.* ap Clem. *Strom.* 6, 6, 48.

[4] Comp. 1 Peter i. 23, also the theory of the incarnation in the Epistles to the Hebrews and of Barnabas; comp. on this subject, below. For the *Kerygma Petri*, comp. Clem., *Strom.* 1, 29, 181; 6, 5, 39—41; 6, 6, 48; 6, 15, 128. *Fragm.* 58. Credner, *Beiträge*, I. pp. 351 sqq. Comp. Clem. 1, 29, and *Fragm.* 58, *Χριστὸς νόμος καὶ λόγος*; Clem. 6, 5, 39 sqq., *τὰ Ἑλλήνων καὶ Ἰουδαίων παλαιά.*

to the history a form freely moulded according to the philosophical and religious idea which he confessed himself to be anxious to serve? After so many perplexing enigmas, the plain question of the historical character of this Gospel cannot be evaded any longer; the question as to whether the writer was an eye-witness may be the more unhesitatingly deferred, because his being such is scarcely seriously affirmed in the Gospel, and the question itself will be decided by the inquiry into the historical character of the book.

ε.—*Historical Character.*

Among the false means diligently and effectively employed by an untrue theology to quiet men's minds, one of the principal is the wanton assertion that the doubts concerning the fourth Gospel entertained by Baur are obsolete—an assertion which is now to be heard from many professorial chairs in German universities, and which is embraced as a golden truth in circles marvellously ready to live upon faith in words and men. But, in fact, the state of the case is the very opposite of that which this illusion supposes, and Baur's chief defect was that he did not sufficiently prove the unhistorical character of this Gospel—that he drew his proofs more from the underlying fundamental idea than from the facts of history.

Our present inquiry is capable of a three-fold division: the Gospel in itself, the Gospel in comparison with Paul, and finally, in comparison with the Synoptics.

The discussion as to whether the Gospel has an historical aim or not, need not be re-opened. Careful investigation has shown that its aim is not historical, its means are historical, but its pure history is possibly disturbed by its unhistorical aim. Therefore its actually unhistorical character must first be shown. On the other hand, another point already mentioned and closely connected with the inquiry as to the aim of the book, leads us

at the outset to the assumption of an—in part, at least—unhistorical character. The Gospel of selections is a one-sided Gospel. By omitting many parts of the life of Jesus altogether, and by keeping in view another part with an almost exclusive persistency, it gives at any rate a one-sided and only half-true picture of that life. This is frankly admitted by Weizsäcker, while Ewald's satisfaction in the favourable and corroborative silence of John as to the Synoptics is not reassuring. For the Gospel makes—and that the more, the more self-contained it is—an impression as a whole which does not admit of additions. To interpolate the material of the other Gospels is too difficult even for the most painstaking and keen-sighted art of the present day. To introduce the material, and yet more the spirit of the sayings and acts of Jesus, from the other Gospels, would be to create a phantom, a hybrid of contradictions. A Gospel which not merely does not contain, but carefully excludes, a long series of legitimate traditions, is an extremely one-sided Gospel.

But let us look more closely. The book is not only very one-sided, it is also in a high degree subjective, i. e. arbitrary in its history. The most favourably-disposed readers have asked themselves how the writer could have retained in his memory these long, interminable discourses of Jesus, which are often without the support of an historical situation, without those pearls of teaching, the parables, and, notwithstanding their thoughtful character, without any strictly agumentative progression. And after all they have said of the imbuement of the writer's mind with the spirit and thought of Jesus, Lücke, Luthardt, Ewald, and Weizsäcker, are compelled to recognize the author's subjective freedom in these spun-out compositions. This freedom, both in form and matter, is seen—and was seen by Bretschneider—to be confirmed by the complete harmony between the words and sentiments of the Evangelist when speaking in his own person (comp. i. 1—18), as well as of the author of the Epistle, with the utterances that are ascribed to Jesus; and the impression that

in this Gospel it is not Jesus himself, but the writer, who speaks, is all the stronger because in some places the words of John pass without a definite boundary-line into those of the Evangelist, and in other places the Evangelist's reflections into the utterances of Jesus.[1] It may be said that the author has become so imbued with Jesus' mode of expression, that he finally speaks one language with him; but who is to distinguish between "Mine" and "Thine," especially in the case of an author who is talented and daring enough to be an "I," and not a shadow? Finally, when not only the Evangelist, but also the independent prophet, the Baptist, and even the man who was born blind, use the language and the irony of Jesus, is it more probable that Jesus speaks in John and the blind man, or that the Evangelist uses one language—his own literary language—and sphere of thought for himself and Jesus, for John and the blind man?[2] Another evidence of the author's subjective freedom is to be found in the minutely elaborate mysticism of the triple form into which not only some of the lesser scenes, but the whole life of Jesus is thrown. Who will venture to believe that the history of Jesus was, by his pre-ordination or prevision, forced into these exact, orderly, ornate, and altogether mechanical frames,—broken up into this well-arranged and carefully-composed set of picture sheets? Who is responsible for the six feasts, the three Passovers, the triple appearance of Galilee and Jerusalem in journeys and miracles? The author, who has given such a high polish to the life of Jesus that it deserves to be called an ingenious work of art, rather than the most serious occurrence in history. And who cannot see that the author has, in other respects also, not arranged the history according to strict reality, but at his desk and in harmony with the order of his pages, when Jesus, at various times, in various places, and in the presence of various men, falls back on former utterances of his own or of his oppo-

[1] Comp. for the first, iii. 16 sqq.; for the second, xii. 37, 44.

[2] Comp. especially iii. 27—36; also ix. 27, 30, 33.

nents in a manner intelligible to the reader of the foregoing chapters, but by no means intelligible to his hearers ?[1]

Thus far the author's subjective freedom has betrayed itself as a freedom which affects even the very pith of the narrated histories and sayings. But it is also quite possible to lay bare the more peculiar tenets of this author, and to show how those tenets were applied to the history of Jesus, and at the same time to establish the gravest doubts as to the historical character of the most important of the acts and sayings of Jesus. From the very beginning, the author has not imposed upon himself silence as to the system of thought which he held with solemn conviction, nay, with energetic pathos. It is noteworthy that, before he comes to the history of Jesus, he gives us his own philosophic view of the world: this is the view peculiar to the Philonic theology, which adopts Christianity as the beginning and end of the ways of God.[2] When an historian begins with his philosophy, we have good ground for the conviction that we have to do with an author whose starting-point and deepest sympathy are bound up with his philosophical studies, who converts history into a philosophy of history, and whose historical communications consist of a not always trustworthy accommodation of facts to the points of view of his general conception of the universe. Such a conviction must be arrived at in the present case, or can be only arbitrarily and irrationally warded off. This historian begins with the origin of the world, the return of the world to God, the pre-temporal Logos, who is the mediator between God and the world, between light and darkness; and refers to the advents of the Logos into the world of darkness from the creation downwards, through general history down to the sacred history itself. He recognizes this operative Logos in the mind of man, even of the Gentile, in the religion of Israel, but chiefly in the

[1] Comp. vii. 19 sqq., xiii. 33.

[2] i. 1—18. Neither Langen, *Judenth. in Pal. z. Zeit Christi*, 1866, p 279, nor Riggenbach, *Zeugn. f. Joh. Progr.* 1866, p. 19, finds any trace of speculation. The Catholic, however, admits that the idea of the Logos had its origin in Alexandria.

person of Jesus, and in the fellowship of the Christian Church; side by side with this, he sees the struggles of that darkness which is sometimes broken through by the Logos, and sometimes roused to more energetic resistance; and he accepts it as his vocation to portray, from his own high position, the life of Jesus as the advent of light into the darkness—an advent which both illuminates men and at the same time awakes to action all the inimical spirits of the world of wickedness.

It must be said that the author has incorporated his ideas into the life of Jesus with mathematical exactness. This striking *rapport* between idea and reality has been, for evident reasons, felt to be inconvenient; but the most determined and avowedly one-sided hunt after a distinction at any price, after a history of facts independent of ideas, has been rewarded, at the very most, only by the discovery that while the author in his preface speaks of a Logos, Jesus never does; naturally, for the author had tact enough not to force his philosophical terminology upon the history, but only subtly to suggest that its meaning was there. In fact, is not the sum and substance of this history to be explained from the philosophy which stands at its gates, and furnishes us with its programme? Since this Christ is the Logos, we can understand how it is that he is ever shedding forth divine glory, and again and again speaks only of himself, of his pre-existence, of his equality with God as well as of his ready obedience to God. We can understand how it is that from the very first he knows everything, can foretell everything, can do everything; and how it is that, as a Philonic Logos disdaining "earthly needs," he is not born, is not baptized, neither wrestles nor suffers, stands far above Moses and John, far above his province and his nation, is a man of the city, a man of the world, and as a manifestation of God, enduring not merely for one day nor for one year, but, being without childhood and youth, is three years in the world as an active personality, and remains there perpetually as the Spirit. We can understand, finally, how it is that his activity has a double accompaniment

—on the one hand, that of faith which, at the first view of the light, called him by the mouth of Andrew and Peter "Christ, the Son of God;" and, on the other hand, that of misunderstanding and unbelief, which prove the eternal and essential darkness of the world by foolishness of speech, and by wickedness of action, and by the revolt of a whole nationality, issuing in his crucifixion.

We are told that it is possible that the author found, in the person of Jesus, not only that actual historical manifestation which corresponded in some way to his idea, but that which wholly corresponded to it, and was in all points honestly and exactly conterminous with it. But is this identity of the idea and the reality probable? Is not the development of the reality out of the idea equally possible? In view of the notorious freedom of the writer, is not this development probable? Even before historical proofs are adduced, the fact of the idealization of the reality can be shown from the book itself. Of such a fact there can be no doubt: this picture of Christ corresponds to the requirements of a human being in only the narrowest sense; it belies our own experience of human nature, of its limitations as a creature, of its slow growth, its need of acquiring knowledge, and its struggling; and it allies in an inconceivable manner divine majesty and human limitedness. Who can bring order and harmony into the life of one who wanders from place to place and is weary, and yet can vanish or move the world; of one who actually and truly hungers and thirsts, and yet can create food and drink out of nothing; of one who is taken prisoner by treachery, and yet dies of his own free will (a new form of voluntary death), and who, still of his own free will, rises again from the dead? Nor will a fuller consideration of the matter make the idealization of the history less unquestionable. Jesus could not, even had he been able, have spoken and acted as he is represented to have done: it is impossible that he should have provoked contradiction by uttering unintelligible riddles, that he should have sanctified unbelief by annihilating

religious faith without any well-considered ground, that he should have turned the world upside down by reversing the natural order of things. And again, it is impossible that the disciples should have answered as they are represented to have done, especially if they had had a definite faith from the beginning; nor could Nicodemus have spoken so blunderingly, nor the people so foolishly, however low might have been the level of their ideas. These dialogues cannot represent the reality,—they could have been carried on only between the conception, the abstract idea, the Logos, on the one hand, and the darkness of the world on the other. The reader can perceive, also, that the hard and refractory historical reality, to which violence is so often done, nevertheless here and there in the book refuses to accommodate itself to the idea.[1] This Christ knows from the beginning what is in man, and yet chooses as a disciple a Judas who betrays him. He knows of himself of the death of Lazarus, and yet, on the other hand, learns that he is sick only through messengers.[2] He is exalted above every attack, and yet is persecuted, apprehended, bound and slain. Is all this sufficiently explained out of the knowledge and will of Jesus? He opens, prosecutes and closes his career to so large an extent in Jerusalem, that Galilee learns its faith from Jerusalem; and yet he is called the Galilean prophet![3]

But the objections which the earlier records of the life of Jesus—Paul and the three Gospels—offer to the historical character of this book, are far more important. We cannot fail to recognize an essential relationship between the views of the author and Pauline ideas—the former containing an unhistorical development of the latter. In Paul's writings, also, the person

[1] It is easy to see that the alterations and omissions occur exactly in those particulars of the life of Jesus which chiefly reveal his dependence and suffering: his birth, training, baptism, inward conflicts, the choice of the betrayer, Gethsemane, Golgotha.

[2] Comp. vi. 70, xi. 3, 4, 11.

[3] vii. 52. That he came out of Galilee is also admitted, iv. 44, for his "own country" cannot refer to Judæa: rather Jesus obtains a hearing in Galilee, his own country, after he has won a recognition at Jerusalem.

of Jesus stands as the central point (but without the suppression of the substantial benefits of the kingdom of God); there also, in accordance with Philonic views, which Paul shares with John, the person of Jesus goes back into a pre-temporal existence; there also is the Law abrogated, the law of Christ, the rule of love, the era of the Spirit, substituted for it, and the Gentiles are called. Many of these opinions are more vigorously and also more harshly developed by John than even by Paul, as, e.g., the Christology and the opposition to the Law,—for Paul's pious reverence prevented him from ever speaking of the Law as the Law of the Jews, *your* Law.[1] It is worth while to observe that the Jesus of John outbids, in his stern deduction of consequences from his premises, the Apostle whose radicalism met with so little support in the community of the immediate followers of Jesus. But, further, we are not concerned with Paul's own personal opinions, but with what he taught as being derived from Jesus. Paul is altogether ignorant of Jesus' having demonstrated his own pre-temporal existence, or that while on earth he abrogated the Law and called the Gentiles as well as the Jews. Had he known all this, he would have declared it, and not the very opposite; he would thus have been at peace instead of war with the Jerusalemites; and the Jerusalemites themselves would have given their full assent to the Pauline abrogation of the Law and breaking down of the national limitations. The fundamental principles of the teaching of Jesus in John's Gospel are unhistorical, for they convert history—the great and severe struggles of the apostolic age—into a mere phantom, a dream, foolishness. In yet another main point, Paul contradicts the portrait of Christ in John. In accordance with the words of Jesus himself, to which words he appeals, Paul places the kingdom of God essen-

[1] viii. 17, x. 34, xv. 25. Comp. v. 39, viii. 54, 56. Paul says simply, ὁ νόμος, never ὁ νόμος Ἰουδαίων. Comp. also my *Gesch. Christus*, p. 14, note. Those who seek to explain away difficulties will never succeed in rebutting these objections,—at any rate, they will not do so by asserting that the opposition to the Old Testament is only *apparent*. Nothing is to be said of Riggenbach's somewhat trifling justification of the Johannine expression (*Zeugnisse f. Johannes*, p. 14).

tially in the future, and though that kingdom throws some light upon the present, yet he sighs for the returning Lord, whom he, with all the Church on earth, hopes to live to see; but the Christ of John preaches the God-filled blessed present, which takes no thought of time since it is superior to all time; and though the future tense is sometimes used, yet he preaches the future in full earnestness only so far as to substitute the Spirit for his own personal return, and the real kingdom of heaven, a future among the stars, for the kingdom upon earth.[1] Paul also corrects the fourth Gospel on one important detail of fact. John is wholly silent as to the institution of the Lord's Supper; but Paul, on the other hand, sensible of the great importance of this transaction, gives the most exact account of it. And what is equally significant, he describes the Lord's Supper essentially in the forms of the Passover meal, and thus clearly shows that its solemn institution fell on the day of the Jewish Passover meal, which was held on the 14th, and only on the 14th, of Nisan. By this information, he proves not only the inaccuracy of the account in the fourth Gospel—which finds room on the last evening of Jesus for everything except this sacred transaction of his—but also the completely unhistorical character of the statement of this Gospel, that Jesus died on the 14th of Nisan, i. e. on the day of the Passover meal. Paul himself gives the foundation of John's incorrect account, when he calls Jesus the Passover lamb that was slain for us; but he does not say that Jesus died on the same day as the Passover lamb. The Evangelist, however, whose purpose it was to remove the legal feast from Christianity, and to exhibit Christ here also as the end of the Law and of all sacrifice, makes it appear that Jesus ate no Passover lamb on the appointed day, and therefore instituted no

[1] The present kingdom is alluded to by Paul only in 1 Cor. iv. 20; Rom. xiv. 17; elsewhere it is always the future, eagerly-longed-for kingdom. The eschatological future is, on the other hand, scarcely traceable in John v. 28; for the rest, it is only the above-mentioned historical future; comp. xiv. 17, &c. The kingdom of heaven, xii. 32, xii. 26, xiv. 1 sqq., xvii. 24. It is well known that this conception is scarcely alluded to by Paul, 2 Cor. v. 8; Phil. i. 23.

Lord's Supper, since he himself was the Passover lamb, which was slain on the 14th and not on the 15th of Nisan.[1]

Upon all these and other points the Synoptics stand arrayed against the fourth Gospel, and the fact is simply the reverse of what Godet somewhat hastily assures his readers, when he says that every historical difference between the fourth Gospel and the others is a confirmation of the superiority of John.[2] Even when the latter is in closer agreement with certain of our earlier Gospels, his greater affinity to their later characteristics can be observed—e. g. in the rising above what is Jewish, the favour shown to the Gentiles, the interest exhibited in what concerned the Samaritans, the exaggeration of the miraculous, and in the heightened mysteriousness; and the Christ of John shares, especially with Luke and Mark, a general approach to what is apocryphal, and in this respect even goes beyond those Gospels. But upon many points he has all three—i. e. the whole tradition of the Church—against him.[3] We will say nothing here of the thorough contrast between the concrete many-sidedness and homely naturalness of the traditional course of life, sayings, and acts of Jesus, and the already noticed Johannine one-sidedness and monotony of the dialectic and obtrusive testimony of Jesus to himself—which even Weizsäcker admits, after all his attempts to explain it away; but we will proceed to mention the most obvious concrete contradictions.[4]

The Synoptics differ from John above all upon the cardinal point of the Christological idea. While the Gospel of John not

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 23 sqq., also v. 7. Paul does not sanction the introduction of the washing of the disciples' feet; comp. 1 Cor. xi. 23, x. 1 sqq., xii. 13.

[2] P. 61.

[3] The assertion of Weizsäcker's (p. 272) that our three Gospels give only a one-sided tradition of an originally single source, is capable of refutation. Whatever may be thought of the sources of the Synoptics, Luke shows in his preface that he made use of *many sources*, and drew up a careful account based upon *all*.

[4] Just., *Ap.* I. 14, *βραχεῖς καὶ σύντομοι παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγοι γεγόνασιν, οὐ γὰρ σοφιστὴς ὑπῆρχεν.* This characteristic, as Volkmar justly maintains, belongs *only* to the Synoptics (*Urspr. unserer Evang.* p. 107).

merely—as Godet says—records the great days of the testimony of Jesus, especially in Jerusalem, but also fills every page with sayings about his pre-temporal existence and his equality with God; the older Gospels do not give a syllable from the mouth of Jesus about his pre-temporal existence, nor do they represent him as referring to his consciousness of oneness with God in his every-day intercourse, but only at certain isolated and exalted moments of his life.[1] It is clear that we have in John's Gospel a highly-coloured description, which is historically most doubtful, but which is fully explicable from the Evangelist's philosophical standpoint. Who, in the present day, will venture to assert that these utterances of Jesus were too exalted for the other Evangelists, who, however, possess similar sayings, though of a more moderate character, and who were no mere Jews, but all of them liberal-minded, and even Pauline? The other Gospels also portray, in everything else, that human nature and naturalness of character which are at once indications of historical reality and postulates of our reasonable thought. We find in the Jesus of those Gospels a growth, a knowledge, and an ignorance, an appropriation of the independent achievements of others—especially of his predecessor, who is not merely his forerunner—an advance with the times and with his historical relations, a moral conflict without inviolable goodness, a conflict that is accompanied with agitation and violent excitement, wavering, weakness, and fainting — facts which are unhesitatingly struck out by the fourth Evangelist. In the Synoptics, the surroundings of Jesus also exhibit symmetry in the midst of variety. Belief and unbelief do not spring up at once, but are naturally and gradually developed; the misunderstanding is less gross, and the lights and shadows are less violently contrasted; there is also the co-operation of men: Jesus needs not only a John in order to be himself, but also a believing people, in order that, under the stimulus of his powerful mind (and not

[1] Comp. Matt. xi. 27. All proofs of the identity of the fundamental view are based upon delusion. Comp. Godet, pp. 80 sq.

of mere logic) and in his intercourse with men miracles may occur; and he needs worshippers at his feet, in order that he may rise to the full height of his office. This is nature in opposition to art.[1]

In the Synoptics, especially in the oldest of them, the attitude of Jesus towards the Law is, in a hundred sayings, characterized by the most reverent piety; and notwithstanding the spiritualizing tendency of the Gospels, a perpetual effort is made to maintain this attitude. This is a different world from John's, even though John tells of journeys to the feasts—for those journeys are only to the "feasts of the Jews," and the tendency of his narratives is to depreciate what was old.[2] In the Synoptics, also, there is the same piety towards the nation, a slow and difficult breaking loose from it, a circumspect coming to an understanding with the Gentiles, and not even in the most advanced—Luke—are any great conquests made in Samaria. Finally, in the Synoptics the idea of the Messiah is highly spiritualized, yet not so much so as to interfere with the most lively expectation of an earthly kingdom and of a return of Jesus to the earth.

The time and place of the ministry of Jesus are differently fixed. The other Gospels clearly allow space for only one year of teaching (to deny which is to blunder grossly), while the fourth Gospel gives about three years.[3] It would be absurd to say that the one year of the Synoptics, on which they themselves lay so little stress, is an intentional accommodation to

[1] Matt. xi. 25 sqq., xii. 49, xiii. 58; Mark vi. 5. Comp. *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 80 sqq.; Schenkel, *Characterbild*, p. 25.

[2] Hilgenfeld, *Ev.* p. 330. Hilg. and Volkmar have too much overlooked the positive relation to the Old Testament; Weizsäcker and—still more—Godet (pp. 18 sq.) have exaggerated it.

[3] Comp. *Gesch. Christus*, pp. 238 sqq. Riggenbach (*Zeugnisse f. Johannes*, 1866), in adducing, with a commendation of Strauss' greater impartiality (p. 9), Matt. xii. 1, as already pointing to two Passovers, overlooks the fact that the history indicates May or June, and that moreover I have never denied two Easters, since I reckon from the beginning of the year 34 to April in 35. Further proofs in the history of Jesus itself.

the prophetic passage about the acceptable year of the Lord, or to affirm that such a wealth of deeds and sayings could not have been poured forth in one year. The artificial basis of the triplet of years is very obvious; and quite as obvious is the impossibility of Jesus' having so long asserted himself against the full power of the hierarchy. The chronology, as well as the reckoning of the ancient Church, decide against it. In the earlier Gospels the place of the ministry of Jesus is at first and preponderantly Galilee, and finally Jerusalem; but in John it is first and last and preponderantly Jerusalem, so much so that there are only a few hasty excursions to Galilee, and the Jerusalemitic facts form the basis of even the Galilean conception of Jesus.[1] For several decades, it has been customary to dispose of the Synoptics by charging them with giving a one-sided Galilean standpoint, and with having in only a few passages, and then involuntarily, borne a faithful testimony. But in truth, those few passages demand an altogether different interpretation; and the so-called Galilean standpoint (a mere empty phrase, utterly meaningless as applied to the sum total of the Gospels with their wealth of written sources, and directly contradicted by the Jerusalemitic first Gospel) presents a much more faithful narrative of the Jerusalemitic close of the history, than is given by the pretended Judaic-Jerusalemitic John.[2] In addition to this, the sources of the Acts of the Apostles support the Synoptics; even John's Gospel has a trace of the "Galilean" prophet; the joyous, animated, and undisturbed ministry of Jesus is conceivable only in the province; and finally, no human ingenuity can explain the transference of the life of Jesus from the holy city into the province, while the reception of the despised provincial, who was the Logos, into the city of God, is quite intelligible.[3]

[1] iv. 44, 45. [2] *Gesch. Chr.* p. 19. Comp. Schenkel, l.c., p. 18.

[3] Acts x. 37 sqq.; John vii. 52. Ewald (p. 13) also involuntarily betrays the point of view of the Gospel: it prefers to relate the Judæan ministry, lest it should be supposed that Jesus wrought only in *a corner of Galilee.*

The description of the fall of Jesus in Jerusalem by the Synoptics is essentially different from that given by John. That fall is brought about by his entry into Jerusalem as the Messiah, by his zealot-like act in the temple, and by the weightiest controversies with the ruling sects on grave matters relevant to the questions at issue between him and them. It is a most incomprehensible assertion of Weizsäcker's that, in the Synoptics, the fatal storm breaks forth over Jesus without any conceivable cause; these Gospels contain, in point of fact, a drama unequalled in grandeur and uninterrupted internal development. In John's Gospel it is otherwise. All the motives for the fall of Jesus have long been exhausted. Jesus has been long and continuously in Jerusalem, so that it is impossible to understand a solemn entry; he has, at the very outset, violently purified the temple; he has long since fully explained himself to the "Jews" —rulers and people; he has revealed all the great and unshakable evidences of his divine Sonship; and he can no longer fight over the great questions of the Law, since for him the Law has long since become invalid. Nevertheless, the catastrophe must come, and it must be introduced by the historical Messianic entry of Jesus into the city with a jubilant escort of the people. Some fresh occurrence must make his entry, his escort, his arrest, imprisonment, and death, intelligible; and this perfectly fresh occurrence is the raising of Lazarus in the neighbouring village of Bethany. On account of this mighty deed, the people hasten to meet him, hailing him as the Messiah, a title which he recognizes by mounting the ass; while on the other hand, his adversaries, exasperated by the miracle and the conduct of the people, prepare their fatal weapons.[1] The death of Jesus, therefore, hangs upon the miracle at Bethany,—in other words, it hangs altogether in the air. As to this greatest miracle, the motive and occasion of the death of Jesus, the earlier Gospels preserve a fatal silence,—those very Gospels which are im-

[1] Chaps. xi. xii., especially xii. 9 sqq.

measurably superior to John's in the concrete fidelity of their account of the life of Jesus and also of his fall. Is it possible that they should have overlooked the leading fact, the most brilliant miracle, the most exasperating offence,—that they should have slept with Lazarus? Only the most absurd explanations of this silence have hitherto been offered, when the critics, with canting resignation, have not preferred to acknowledge its inexplicability. Moreover, John has so related this greatest of miracles that no one can accept his account literally. This miracle, this help in time of need, is not only too great,—the raising of a man four days dead and beginning to decay is nowhere else heard of,—but the behaviour of Jesus, both before and during the act, is strange and repelling, and—as is the case everywhere in this Gospel—the purely ideal character of the transaction is apparent: even resurrection from the dead, whether it be that of the Lazarus in the parable of the rich man, or that of Jesus himself, cannot break down the unbelief of the world; and again, life, resurrection in every one, is in the highest sense the first and last characteristic of the Lord, who awakens Lazarus in order to awaken eternally himself and his own people. And if the fact be correct, does this fact explain the solemn entry of Jesus, who had never before made such an entry? Could he have entered the city at all as the Messiah in the spirit of this Gospel? Could he have entered, claiming to be the Messiah, after the order for his arrest had been given? Can the offence given by the miracle suffice to explain his death—that death which in the other Gospels receives such a different, a so much more impressive explanation?

The closing scene also excites doubt. It has already been pointed out that the undoubted celebration of the Lord's Supper is passed over; but, as its place must be filled, there are substituted for it an altogether different and unattested transaction—which, as even Weizsäcker admits, could at least not have happened on the same evening—and long parting addresses, whose length and tenor exhibit a striking psychological contrast to the

solemn and oppressed bearing of the Jesus of the Synoptics. The captivating human characteristics of Gethsemane and Golgotha are entirely wanting. The trial is, with all its details, obscure and confused exactly in the main points, for neither are the charges against Jesus distinctly stated, nor is the bearing of Pilate—who is represented as uniting with the desire to save Jesus the highest degree of scorn and mockery and provocation of the Jews—by any means intelligible. Finally, the day of the death is altered in favour of an idea—the idea of the dying Passover lamb—and is transferred from the 15th to the 14th of Nisan; and the objection of opponents, that Jesus could not have been executed on a feast-day refutes itself—as Bleek's learned argument plainly shows, to his own disadvantage—since the religious idea of the Jews, as we see from Matthew, was quite different, and the same hesitation would have been exhibited with reference to the eve of the Sabbath as with reference to the feast itself.[1] Hence the contemptible zeal to bring the Synoptics into harmony with John.[2]

Let this suffice; we pass over other things in silence. But we must by no means omit to refer to the numerous historical and geographical errors which it is customary to establish by reference to the Synoptics, the Old Testament, Josephus, and even Eusebius and Jerome. The assumed errors as to Bethany and Bethesda, Cana and Kedron, Salim and Sychar, as to the high-priest for that year, and the distance from Cana to Capernaum, from Bethany to Peræa, are often the less admitted, because elsewhere the author shows a tolerably good acquaintance with the land, and because the most difficult can be explained as intentional on the part of the author. The high-priest of "the year of death" is a distinctive appellation, and by no means implies an annual change; Sychar is a provincial or contemptuous

[1] Bleek, *Beiträge*, pp. 139 sqq.; *Einleitung ins N. T.* pp. 181 sqq.

[2] Comp. the detailed examination by Schenkel, pp. 355 sqq. The recent reaction in favour of the day of the Synoptics, from Wieseler (comp. Bäumlein, Hengstenberg, Tholuck) to Riggenbach, *Zeugnisse f. das Ev. Joh.* 1866, p. 37.

name for Sichem; Salim and Ænon (Ain) lie in Judæa, or, perhaps better, in Samaria, to the confines of which the predecessor of him who sat by Jacob's well extended his ministry; and the exaggeration of distances is made subservient to the exaggeration of miracles. If, besides the want of harmony between John's Gospel and Paul and the Synoptics, an instance is asked for of that between it and the extra-biblical sources, we will simply mention the fact that the mystical and mysterious Baptist who, in the fourth Gospel, proclaims the secret of Christ's pre-existence, and of the cross, nay, of the whole Christ, is not only diametrically opposed to the Baptist of the three Synoptics, but also to the energetic, practical, nationally-limited prophet of Josephus.[1]

The historical defects of the fourth Gospel are being ever more fully and more widely recognized. Yet the mind is so dazzled by the incontestable splendours of the Gospel, that men are continually found vying with each other in attempting to save as much as possible of this wonderful work of art from the consuming fire of criticism. While the attempt to save as good, genuine, apostolic, historical, either the sayings, or the narratives, or at least a part of the narratives (Paulus, Weisse, Schweizer) is scarcely relinquished—Renan, indeed, repeated such an attempt too late, whilst Al. Schweizer at the same time acknowledged its futility—a fresh attempt has been recently made, though in a less definite, less specialized manner, to divide this enigmatical book into what on the one side is less historical, and what on the other side is very faithful to history. This remarkable thesis of the "double visage" has lately—since Lücke—been defended by many, including among others Ewald, Weizsäcker, and Brückner. These critics acknowledge the absence of a strictly historical purpose in the Gospel, and also the predominance of idea, a great distance from the events, a certain volatility, airiness, as Godet says, and an extensive one-sidedness of treatment—facts coloured by the writer's

[1] The above questions will come under discussion in the course of this history.

opinions and degraded into material to serve his purpose, fundamental ideas and abstractions without clear and definite perception, centralization without well-marked circumference and without historical development. These critics further acknowledge that the picture here given of the life of Jesus is, in comparison with that of the Synoptics, without variety, indistinct, almost nebulous, and yet again philosophically hard and cold, while the sayings of Jesus are thoroughly subjectively coloured in expression, thought, and context, and are subjective (according to Weizsäcker) even in the Christological idea which, based on the preface, is everywhere introduced. *But*, together with all this, there is to be found, according to Brückner, a certain objectivity; according to Weizsäcker, a firm basis and the confident air of real recollection of a number of details; according to Ewald and Godet, the purest history and the most remarkable conscientiousness of the truth-loving Apostle, even though he handles the history somewhat "airily," or, as it is remarked in passing, makes the sayings of the Lord live again, after the manner of the Greeks and Romans. How, then, do they attempt to establish these contradictions, this good, ultimate basis of faith? Naturally, a considerable use is made of general statements; Luthardt speaks of conceptions which could not have had their origin in mere ideas; De Wette, of a more than earthly fire-coruscation; Lücke, of a Xenophontic and Platonic Christ; while others—Bleek, Weizsäcker—speak of the Galilean standpoint of the Synoptics, of the impossibility of a writer's venturing to depart widely from the Synoptics without sufficient cause, without having been himself an eye-witness, and with no other ground than mere invention.

The proof of this view consists in trifles: the Gospel "occasionally" gives very reliable notices, or exhibits the strictest conscientiousness by refraining from the introduction of at least the name of the Logos into the history, by the correction of particular assertions made by the Synoptics, and by distinguishing between the history and the later reflections of the disciples. A

wonderful valuation of faithfulness in trifles, while it is wanting in larger matters,—a valuation, moreover, that is the very opposite of the correct one, since the motive for these distinctions and those corrections is very different from that assumed by the persons who make such a valuation![1] Finally, as a matter of course, the many bleeding wounds of this Gospel are industriously bound up, the indications of apostolic and post-apostolic date as much as possible obliterated, the Synoptics in one place satisfied, in another corrected — John has either something similar, or something better: but justice and truth are never present in this harmonizing, in whose fetters even Ewald and Weizsäcker are held captive. The latter goes so far as to reconcile the sixth chapter with the Synoptic Gospels; to explain as mere external unmeaning semblance the opposition of Jesus to the Law in John's Gospel, and the simply Galilean one-year's ministry in the Synoptics; and to find in John's Gospel the best accounts of the attitude of the life of Jesus with reference to the Jews, of the special Messiah question, and of the catastrophe in Jerusalem. To these attempts, I much prefer Luthardt's blunt determinateness: this history is possible, and therefore it is true to fact.

Essentially illogical and uncritical, incapable of affording any secure foundation for the supposition that the Gospel is the work of two authors, an Apostle and an Apostle's disciple (Ewald, Weizsäcker, in imitation of Paulus), these opinions have no prospect of remaining long in the field. Whoever wishes to save the author's historical character, in spite of his evident historical mistakes, must attempt it in quite a different way,—not trivially, but in grand style. It may be that in small matters this author

[1] Very recently, Riggenbach (l. c., p. 7) has wished us to believe that only the palm branches of John xii. 13 explain the Hosannah-cry of the entry into Jerusalem (comp. Delitzsch in *Rud. Zeitschrift*, 1855, p. 653). As if the branches of trees and garments, Matt. xxi. 8 (comp. Lightfoot on the passage) did not sufficiently explain it. The correction, iii. 24, is made only in order to give room for the swan-like song of the prophet that is to introduce Jesus; the distinction between facts and comments, ii. 19 vii. 38, in order to show the weakness and the mystery.

has here and there derived something of value from the written and oral tradition that was at his disposal, but which we cannot accurately test, — as, possibly, concerning Peræa, Cana and Ephraim, or concerning Nicodemus and Nathanael. History must examine such things—not without mistrust, since it has more trustworthy sources: in the "incidental" notices may occasionally be found a hidden purpose, but also sometimes a reminiscence worth consideration. Considering the Gospel as a whole, however, we find that the good ground which Weizsäcker thought he had discovered is very different from that which his trivial standard enabled him to measure. This ground is not immediately, not literally historical: how can it be so, when we have to admit that the very central point—the Christological idea—has been brought into the history? But on many points that ground is the partly dogmatic, partly even historical, deduction from the history. Jesus by no means claimed that equality with God which this Gospel ascribes to him; but of his oneness with God he had no doubt,—a oneness the roots of which a subsequent age, in order to avert later tendencies to separate between God and the world, between God and Jesus, was compelled to seek in an essential equality with God. He by no means abrogated the Law, or built up a new religion as it were upon the ruins of Moses and the temple; but his fundamental ideas were really superior to the Law, and actually introduced the worship of God in spirit and in truth. He by no means, from the beginning, called Jews and Gentiles indiscriminately, and by no means, from the beginning, foretold his death; but in the middle and at the close of his career he rose to these heights. Finally, he by no means, in the beginning, possessed perfect knowledge and perfect virtue, and by no means, in either the beginning or the end, was he omniscient or omnipotent; but from the beginning he was the wonderful man of God with superior divine powers; he became the possessor of the highest knowledge of God, and the purest expression of victorious human virtue. Thus, throughout, the ideal conception of the Gospel can be traced back to

what is historical; only, among manifold exaggerations of the course of events, as well as of their bearing, the person of Jesus is so conceived and portrayed that the end takes the place of the beginning, completeness of incompleteness, the enduring and eternal of the transitory and temporal.[1] In dependence upon this Eternal One lived, and lives, the Church that came into existence through him. History depends upon both the Eternal One and the Temporal One, passing to the one only by means of the other, to John by means of the Synoptics; and teaches the Church of the present day that without the one the certainty and the consolation of the other cannot be preserved.

ζ.—*Date.*

These conclusions are materially strengthened by indications of a late date and of a late post-apostolic author.

The indications of date that lie outside the work itself, i.e. the external evidences of the existence of the Gospel in the Church, have been zealously and not always dispassionately sought for in modern times in ever-renewed keen-sighted attempts, among which those of Baur and Zeller take exemplary precedence; such indications have been found and, after premature triumph, have been again lost.[2]

The actual indications of the existence of the fourth Gospel in

[1] Similarly Strauss, pp. 140 sq.; but he gives up, more than is necessary, the concrete historical character of the Synoptics, when he says that it is very questionable to which of the two positions Jesus is to be considered as standing nearer,—to the standpoint of Matthew with the permanent validity of the letter of the Law, or to the standpoint of worship in spirit and in truth.

[2] Comp. (in addition to the well-known larger works) respecting the external testimony to the fourth Gospel, especially Zeller, *Theol. Jahrbb.* 1845, pp. 577 sqq.; 1847, pp. 136 sqq.; 1853, pp. 144 sqq. Baur, *Zur Joh. Frage*, *ibid.* 1857, pp. 209 sqq. Volkmar, *ibid.* 1854, pp. 446 sqq., and *Urspr. uns. Evangelien*, 1866. On the opposite side, Bleek, *Beiträge*, pp. 200 sqq. Jakobi, *Deutsche Zeitschrift*, 1851, No. 28. Schneider, *Ueber de Aechtheit des Joh. Ev.* 1854. Ewald, *Jahrb.* V. pp. 178 sqq. And quite recently, Tischendorf, *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?* 1865. Also Riggenbach, *Programm*, 1866, *Die Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Joh. neu untersucht.*

the history of the Church extend about as far back as those of the other Gospels; and regarding the latter as predecessors of the former, we are able to place the first appearance of the fourth Gospel at the very earliest in the beginning of the second century.[1] The name of the Gospel, its designation "according to John," appears somewhat later than the first traces in Papias and Justin of the names of the Synoptics, namely, about A.D. 170—180, in the Muratorian Fragment, and in Theophilus (A.D. 180); and our Gospels appear, arranged in their existing order and number, at the beginning of the Catholic age, in the above-mentioned Fragment and in the great doctors of the Church. But the Gospel was in use before it is mentioned by name, and in our existing literature traces of it are found as early as those of the Synoptics. This opinion, however, has been warmly contested by the school of Baur up to the present day. It is admitted that the Gospel was in circulation about A.D. 160—170, and was used by Athenagoras, Tatian, in all the spurious Epistles of Ignatius, by Melito, Apollinaris, and Theophilus, and even by the heathen Celsus, who, contemporaneously with Athenagoras the apologist before the imperial throne (176, 177), addressed his work, written in the interests of peace, to the Christians; and with the aid of the recently discovered conclusion to the Clementine Homilies, which most clearly makes use of the narrative of the man who was born blind, the author of the Homilies, after long opposition, has been admitted to have been acquainted with this Gospel; there exists, however, as yet, no satisfactory ground for assigning to the Homilies a date earlier than A.D. 160.[2] Zeller, and even Ewald, emphati-

[1] Also other N. T. writings have points of contact with the fourth Gospel: Eph. v. 11, 13 (John iii. 20); 1 Tim. iii. 16; James i. 17 sq., iii. 15, iv. 4, 17; 1 Peter i. 23. Also the Epistle to the Hebrews. But an investigation of the question of priority would carry us too far, especially as the date of these writings themselves is not established. An early testimony is also the spurious appendix, John xxi., which, however, is scarcely much older than the close of the second century. Comp. 2 Peter i. 14.

[2] *Ep. Lergd. Vienn.* ap. Eus. 5, 1, quotes as an O. T. prediction (ἐπληροῦτο τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν εἰρημένον), the passage John xvi. 2.

cally deny that Justin Martyr was acquainted with the Logos Gospel, a denial so steadfastly maintained by Volkmar, in opposition to Lücke, Tischendorf, and Weizsäcker, that, in view of the undeniable points of contact, he rather reverses the relation, and makes the fourth Gospel indebted to the Martyr, just as he makes the author of the first Epistle indebted to Polycarp.[1]

We would here, in the first place, observe that chronology comes to the aid of the assumption of the Martyr's dependence upon the fourth Gospel. He wrote his first Apology, neither—as Semisch and Otto suppose—about A.D. 138-9, when it is true he was already a Christian, nor—as Volkmar asserts, in his acute treatise on the date of Justin, 1855—about A.D. 147, but during the last years of the Emperor Antoninus Pius, and in the zenith of Marcion's popularity, about A.D. 155—160.[2] At that period

[1] *Urspr. uns. Ev.* 1866, pp. 91 sqq. The proof of the dependence of the first Epistle upon the Epistle of Polycarp (pp. 47 sqq.) is not conclusive. For the positive statement in 1 John iv. 2 sq., is at least as original as the negative one in Polycarp's Epistle; nor is it by any means meaningless, since the "Ebionites" would certainly not subscribe to this statement. In particular, the conception of "an Antichrist" in Polycarp's Epistle shows a further development, since that development takes its departure from the idea of unity (1 John iv. 3). Moreover, the authenticity even of the "kernel" of Polycarp's Epistle—an Epistle so closely allied to those of Ignatius—is questionable enough.

[2] For a later date, for the closing years of the reign of Antoninus Pius, we have—besides the chronology of the persecutions that began to rage about A.D. 155 (comp. the letters of Antoninus)—the fact that Justin, in his last great work, expected that the bloody work of the Roman emperors would be crowned by the Antichrist (*Tryph.* 39); and the introduction of Marcion, *Ap.* I. 26, is strongly in favour of the later date: ὃς καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἐστὶ διδάσκων—ὃς κατὰ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων πολλοὺς πεποίηκε βλασφημίας λέγειν; I. 58, καὶ νῦν διδάσκει, ᾧ πολλοὶ πεισθέντες, κ. τ. λ. All this exhibits Marcion in the height of a long and widely extended activity, an activity extended westward as far as Rome (where Justin himself was, capp. 26, 56). But this activity, especially in the west, belongs, according to the irrefragable testimony of Irenæus—against which Clement (*Strom.* 7, 17, 106 sqq.) has no weight—to the time of Bishop Anicetus (according to the hitherto most tenable chronology of Eusebius, A.D. 158—168): Marcion illi succedens *invaluit* sub *Aniceto* (*Haer.* 3, 4, 3). Thus is he really the Antonianus hæreticus of Tertullian (*Cont. Marc.* 1, 19), since he was actively engaged during the whole of the reign of Antoninus, A.D. 138—161. The date in *Ap.* I. 46 (A.D. 150), does not really contradict this; and as little does the increased distance from the Hadrianic (not Antonine, *Capit. Ant. Pius*, cap. 5) Jewish war, which in the Apology (I. 31), and in the Dialogue with Trypho (later than the Ap. *Tryph.* 120), appears to have so recently taken place (*Tryph.* 1, 9, 16, 52, 92, 108); for this war was so long past (comp. *Tryph.* 108), that all recollection of the

the Clementine Homilies had already made use of the fourth Gospel. It is also a very noteworthy fact that Justin's scholar, Tatian, has made use of the Gospel of John with special preference. It is easy to show that even the Martyr himself had a number of Johannine passages before him, however much we may, with Zeller, subtract from the "cloud of witnesses." He has the saying of the Baptist, which is found only in John; he describes the birth of Christ with John's dogmatic formula of the seed of the flesh and the will of God; he gives the saying about the new birth with Nicodemus' original misunderstanding of it, and the assertion that the knowledge of the Father and the Son did not exist among the Jews; not to speak of lesser coincidences, on which Riggenbach is disposed to rely.[1] In the above-mentioned passages we have resemblances in the detailing of

prohibition of circumcision, which was imposed by Hadrian and removed by Antoninus, was lost (comp. *Tryph.* 8, 10, 16, 92). It is also self-evident that the oral conversation and its actually being written down may, notwithstanding cap. 80, lie far apart. On the time of Marcion, comp. also his meeting with Polycarp in Rome, under Anicetus, Irenæus, 3, 3, 4; Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 17. Lipsius, *Die Zeit Marcions und Herakleons, Hilg. Zeitschrift*, 1867, pp. 75 sqq., goes too far back in fixing Marcion's activity at Rome between A.D. 140 (145) and 170.

[1] (*a*) *Tryph.* 88: οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ φωνὴ βοῶντος = John i. 21, 23, whilst Volkmar thinks of an "amplification" out of the Acts xiii. 25! (*b*) *Tryph.* 63: τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρωπείου σπέρματος γεγενημένου ἀλλ' ἐκ θελήματος θεοῦ = John i. 13. Also *Ap.* i. 32. (*c*) *Ap.* I. 61, the well-known passage about the second birth and the impossibility of entering a second time into the womb = John iii. 4. (*d*) *Ap.* I. 63: οὔτε τὸν πατέρα οὔτε τὸν υἱὸν ἔγνωσαν = John xvi. 3, viii. 19; it is true that Justin had only Matt. xi. 27, actually lying before him, but it is plain that to him John is here the commentary to Matthew. (*e*) The dependence of the Logos on the action of God, *Tryph.* 56; John v. 19. (*f*) Hope in Moses, "your law" in antithesis to the new law, *Tryph.* 11; John v. 45, viii. 17, xiii. 34. (*g*) Children of God through keeping the commandments, *Tryph.* 123; 1 John iii. 24; comp. *Tryph.* 10, 1; 1 John ii. 3, 4. Other passages cannot be conclusively shown to be Johannine, as *Ap.* I. 22. *Tryph.* 69, ἐκ γενετῆς (not a blind man at all!); *Tryph.* 69, λαοπλάνος; comp. (besides John vii. 12) Matt. xxvii. 63; also the quotation from Zechariah xii. 10 = John xix. 37, in *Tryph.* 14, 32, *Ap.* I. 52, since it is sufficiently explained out of Rev. i. 7, or even the passage concerning the incarnation, *Tryph.* 105, on which (together with *Tryph.* 100, *Ap.* I. 32, 66) Riggenbach lays stress (pp. 84 sqq.). In connection with the former passages, however, the latter acquire greater force; and even the possibility of the belief in the authorship of the Apostle John (*Ap.* I. 66, *Tryph.* 103, Apostle and companion of the authors of the Gospels, as in our Gospel) is to be admitted.

Gospel incidents, for which Justin needed a source; we have striking points of contact with the specific Johannine mode of conception and representation, with which we must also reckon the system of misunderstanding; we have points of agreement which take rank with those of the Clementine Homilies, and to recognize which in the one case and deny them in the other, would be to incur the reproach of being illogical. Leaving these details, it is quite impossible to fail to perceive that the ideas of Justin are, on the whole, far in advance of, and therefore also dependent upon, those of John, as Weizsäcker has recently shown, and Volkmar in a single instance has unfortunately denied. And finally, who can seriously believe that, either in general features or in details, the original, talented author of the Gospel was the scholar of such a mediocre, dependent, unoriginal, ineloquent man as the Martyr notoriously was?[1]

Recognizing Justin's relation to the fourth Gospel—a relation which, since this Gospel is at issue with tradition, as well as with the orthodox belief in a millenial, earthly, Jerusalemitic kingdom, is by no means that of complete assent—several consequences at once follow.[2] That the famous Bishop Papias of

[1] Comp. only (*Tryph.* 34, 61, 128) Justin's theory concerning the manner of the procession of the Logos (the δύναμις λογικὴ, described also by many other titles), without division, without diminution (= word, fire), and yet with individuality, no mere nominal distinction (as sunlight and sun), numerically another, no evanescent appearance, &c. Comp. Weizsäcker, *Joh. Logoslehre*, *Jahrbb. deutsch. Theol.* 1862, pp. 703 sqq. In the passage concerning the new birth, Volkmar finds that one writer must have used the other, but the one who quotes is John (pp. 97 sqq.)! It is incorrect to say that John has converted the Martyr's water-baptism into a spiritual baptism, *i. e.* into a higher one. In the first place, how much more artificial is Justin's theory of baptism? And in connection with the illumination (φωτισμὸς διανοίας), is not the Holy *Spirit* expressly and repeatedly named?—therefore the baptism is *also* a spiritual one! Moreover, the general character of Justin's mind is such (comp. Semisch), that it is impossible to believe in the dependence of the fourth Gospel. On the system of Justin, comp. also Weizsäcker, *Jahrbb. deutsch. Theol.*, 1867, I.

[2] I have no doubt that it was this Gospel's breach with Chiliasm which chiefly repelled Justin. Upon this point *Tryph.* 80 is exceedingly instructive. Mildly as he expresses himself against the non-Chiliasts, he yet says, in conclusion, ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ εἴ τινές εἰσιν ὀρθογνώμονες κατὰ πάντα Χριστιανοὶ, καὶ σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν γενήσεσθαι ἐπιστάμεθα καὶ χίλια ἔτη ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, κ. τ. λ.

Hierapolis, the most orthodox of Chiliasts, made no use of this Gospel (which Tischendorf ought not to dispute), but did, as Eusebius asserts, make use of the first Epistle of John, which is ascribed to the same author, there is less reason to doubt, with Zeller and even with Volkmar, since Papias, as Volkmar also sees, was not an absolutely primitive author, but flourished in the time of Polycarp, about A.D. 180.[1] Here, again, there is no occasion seriously to distrust Tertullian's account of Marcion's rejection of the Gospels of the Apostles, i. e. of Matthew and John.[2] For when was Marcion at the height of his popularity and influence, if not, according to the distinct testimony of Irenæus, under Bishop Anicetus, i. e. A.D. 158—168, at a time, therefore, when the Gospel was already widely used? The same verdict must be arrived at with reference to another Gnostic, Valentinus. Irenæus asserts that the fourth Gospel was extensively used by the Valentinian school; while Tertullian says that the founder of that school himself appeared to have made use of the whole and complete Testament, and the *Philosophoumena* ascribe to Valentinus the use of the saying, John x. 8.[3] In answer to this, we are told of a confounding of scholars and teacher, and this is partly proved; but that the Gospel would serve the purpose of the teacher as well as of his scholars, and that the teacher, making his first appearance under Bishop Hyginus, flourished under the Bishops Pius and Anicetus, i. e. until A.D. 168, or, according to Tertullian, even down to Eleutherus (A.D. 177—190), at a time, therefore, when the Gospel had long been in circulation, are facts which no one can deny.[4]

[1] Eus. 3, 39. Comp. Volkmar, p. 60. It is truly laughable at the present day (*e.g.* Zahn, in his essay on Papias, *Jahrb. deutsch. Theol.* 1866), to explain Papias' remark as to Mark's want of orderly arrangement, as based on a comparison with John, instead of with Matthew.

[2] *Con. Marc.* 4, 2. *De carn. Chr.* 3.

[3] Iren. *Haer.* 3, 11, 7 : Hi autem, qui a Valentino sunt, eo quod est sec. Joh. evangelio plenissime utentes ad ostensionem conjugationum suarum ex ipso detegentur nihil recte dicentes. Tert. *Præscr.* 38, Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur. *Philos.* 6, 35.

[4] For the date of Valentinus, Iren. 3, 4, 3. Tert., *Adv. Val.* 4. Eus. 4, 10 sq.

Thus, unless we are wholly mistaken, this Gospel can be traced back for a full generation beyond the year 160. Since the time of Lücke, men have been strongly disinclined to believe that it is quoted in the earliest documents, the writings of the so-called Apostolical Fathers, in the Epistle of Barnabas, the first of Clement, and the Shepherd of Hermas. "Not the slightest allusion is to be found." Volkmar has recently spoken of Barnabas as being incontestably ignorant of the Logos Gospel, and has explained the early date given to his Epistle by Ewald and Weizsäcker, and now also by Riggenbach, as due to their embarrassment at finding in it no trace of John.[1] But a different view is here possible. However clearly it may be shown that the Epistle of Barnabas gives no narrative, not a single word out of this Gospel, is not acquainted with the conception of the Logos, makes an independent use of the watchword of the water and the blood, or of the types of Christ in the Old Testament, or, above all, of the serpent that was lifted up for believers in the wilderness; yet the inner sphere of thought of this Epistle corresponds with the Gospel in so many ways, both in general features and in details, that scientific criticism is compelled to infer a connection, or renounce its vocation by leaving the enigma unexplained.[2] "The Son of God" must be manifested in the flesh, in suffering, must also be glorified through death and the cross, must bring life and the abiding presence of God: such is in both the prevailing fundamental idea.[3] Existing before the foundation of the world, the Lord of the world, the sender of the prophets and the subject of their predictions, mentally beheld by Abraham, typified in the person of Moses as the one who alone was the hope of Israel, revealed and

[1] Volkmar, *Urspr. uns Ev.* pp. 65 sqq. Zeller has not concerned himself with Barnabas. I myself admit that the traces in Clement are insignificant; compare *μόνος καὶ ἀληθινὸς θεὸς*, cap. 43.

[2] *περὶ τοῦ ὕδατος κ. τοῦ σταυροῦ*, Barn. 11. *ὄφις τύπος Χριστοῦ*, cap. 12.

[3] *υἱὸς θεοῦ*, distinctive, capp. 5, 7. *ἐφανερώθη*, 14. *ἦλθεν ἐν σαρκὶ*, 5. *ἔμελλεν ἐν σαρκὶ φανεροῦσθαι, μέλλων φ. ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ πάσχειν*, 6. *φανερωθεὶς τύπῳ καὶ σαρκὶ*, ib. *δόξα Χριστοῦ, ζωὴ*, cap. 12.

glorified by types before his incarnation, he must at last appear, dwell among us, be seen, not as the son of David, but as the Son of God, wrapped in a garment of flesh, and thus accommodated to the infirmities of those who could not endure even the beams of his earthly sun.[1] Thus he came, thus he even died, in order to fulfil the promises, by his apparent defeat to diffuse purification, forgiveness, and life, to destroy death, vanquish the devil, reveal the resurrection, and with the resurrection his right of future judgment; in order, moreover, to fill up the measure of the sins of that people of Israel whom he specially loved, and for whom he had performed such great wonders and signs; and once more, in order to prepare for himself a new people that should keep his commandments, his new law.[2] He accomplished that which his Father gave him to do, and voluntarily and for our sakes—the true explanation of his death—he accepted his sufferings.[3] "The Jews" did not set their hopes upon him, clearly as the Old Testament types and Moses himself had revealed him; but, led astray into carnal desires by the devil, they forsook the spirituality of Moses, and placing their trust and hopes in the circumcision of the flesh and the material house of God, instead of in God, they worshipped the Lord in the temple almost like Gentiles.[4] But the Christian rises superior to the flesh and to the lusts which obscure both the perception and the will; he rises to what is spiritual and to a spiritual worship, above the ways of darkness to the ways of light; he attains to faith, and with that faith to perfect know-

[1] Revealed in the Old Testament, capp. 5, 12. Abraham, *ἐν πνεύματι προβλέψας εἰς αὐτὸν*, c. 9. Pre-existence, 5, 6, 12. *ἀπὸ καταβ. κόσμου*, 5. Not David's son, 12. *φαν. καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικεῖν*, 6. Necessity of being veiled, 5.

[2] Purpose of his death, specially capp. 5, 6. *ἵνα ἀγνισθῶμεν* (John xi. 55), c. 5. *προσέφερε τὴν σάρκα ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν λαοῦ καινοῦ*, 7. Comp. John xi. 52.

[3] *ἐποίησεν ἐντολήν*, 6. *ὑπέμεινε παραδοῦναι τῇ σάρκα*, 6. *αὐτὸς ἠθέλησεν οὕτω παθεῖν*, 5. Love, 1, 7.

[4] Hope of Jews and Christians (comp. John v. 39, 45), 6, 9, 12, 16, 19. Sensuality, *ἐπιθυμία σαρκὸς*, 10.

ledge, as one who is born again and who is full of the Spirit of God, as one in whom God dwells and speaks, though unseen and unheard, as one to whom God makes plain the past and the future, as a God-taught fulfiller of the commandments of the new law of the Lord, a lover of the brethren, and one who in himself is a child of peace, of joy, and of love.[1] Paul, and even the Epistle to the Hebrews, offer nothing analogous to this system of ideas; the only analogy is to be found in this Gospel, though hitherto this fact has been altogether overlooked. And if any one be disposed to dispute as to the side on which dependence lies—for it might be thought the ideas belong to Barnabas, the application of them and the perfected Logcs conception to John—it must be admitted that the Gospel had its origin very near the time of the Epistle of Barnabas. But it may be more justly said that in Barnabas we find rigid, scholastic theory, a highly developed typology, and an over-refined view of Judaism; moreover, the points of view appear to be derived, not original, e. g., the water and the blood, the new law, the new people; and in the solemn revelation of the Son of God immediately after the selection of the disciples, and in the great and futile miracles and proofs of love to Israel, there is a very evident allusion to history, i. e. to John ii. and xii.[2] But the Epistle of Barnabas, according to the convincing proofs of Volkmar—in spite of Hilgenfeld and Weizsäcker, and now also of Riggenbach—was undoubtedly written at the time of the building of the new temple under the Emperor Hadrian, about A.D.

[1] Spirit 1, 5, 16. Gnosis, 1, 10. Way of light, 19. New birth, 16. Taught of God, 21. Temple of God, *ναὸς ἁγ. τέλειος, κατοικητήριον, θεὸς κατοικῶν ἐν ἡμῖν*, 4, 6, 16. *καινὸς νόμος*, 2. *ἐντολή, πᾶσα ἐντολή*, 9, 19, 21. Love of the brethren, 1, 4. Joy, 7, 21.

[2] Cap. 5, *ὅτε τοὺς ἰδίους ἀποστόλους ἐξελέξατο, τότε ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτον υἱὸν Θεοῦ εἶναι.* This harmonizes completely with John i. 35—ii. 11; comp. vi. 70. Cap. 5, *διδάσκων τὸν Ισραὴλ καὶ τηλικαῦτα τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα ποιῶν ἐκήρυξε καὶ ὑπερηγάπησεν αὐτόν.* But unbelief! (follows in the same chapter, also cap. 12), comp. John xii. 37 sqq., xiii. 1. Certainly Sin. reads *ὑπερηγάπησαν.* But does not suit the whole conception.

120 (according to Volkmar's latest opinion, A.D. 118-9); at the very latest, A.D. 130.[1]

The importance of this subject must excuse the multiplicity of our details. Between Barnabas and Justin stands the Shepherd of Hermas (cir. A.D. 140—150, under Bishop Pius, according to Schwegler, according to Hilgenfeld and Volkmar even ten years earlier), who was evidently acquainted with the first Epistle, while at the same time his whole terminology often reminds us of the Gospel.[2] This also is forgotten. And yet this work is in closest *rapport* with the Epistle, in its exhortation to keep the commandments, in its commendation of the unburdensomeness of the commandments, in its belief in the possibility of a sinless observance of the commandments, and of a victory over Satan, who finds no more place in believers, in its teaching concerning the indwelling presence of God, or of the Son, of the Spirit—a presence which makes all things possible to the pious, and

[1] Barn., capp. 4, 16. Comp. Volkmar, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, pp. 351 sqq.; *Urspr. uns. Ev.* pp. 65 sqq., 110 sqq., 140 sqq. Weizsäcker, *Zur Kritik des Barnabasbriefs, Progr.* 1863, dates the Epistle in the reign of Vespasian; Riggenbach, of Nerva; Hilgenfeld, before Trajan, or in the beginning of his reign; Hefele, in Trajan's reign. The chief evidence lies in cap. 16. The *enemies* who, in accordance with Isaiah xlix. 17, and yet *in opposition to the divine will*, were *now* to rebuild the temple they had destroyed, and with these the *servants of the enemies* (οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπηρέται), cannot possibly (with Hilgenfeld) be the Christians, even though they are afterwards cleverly introduced as spiritual restorers. The reference is to the building of the temple by Hadrian, after A.D. 117. The eschatology in cap. 4 goes chiefly only as far as Nerva, but includes his immediate successors (Trajan, Hadrian). Weizsäcker and Volkmar have here, as may be easily proved, made a false and forced calculation. The ten kings are simply Cæsars down to Vespasian and Domitian, the "little one" after them (ὄπισθεν, and not strictly ἐξ αὐτῶν), who puts down three great kings at once, is the old, weak Nerva (comp. only Aur. Vict. *Cæs.* 12), who made an end of the three dreaded Flavii. In the dynasty founded by him, itself three-fold, more exactly under Hadrian the temple builder (the second Caligula?), the end is to come.

[2] I simply follow the *Mur. Frag.:* Pastorem nuperrime (refers in truth not merely to the relation to the Old Testament) temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Herma conscripsit sedente cathedra urbis Romæ ecclesiæ *Pio episcopo* fratre ejus (A.D. 143—158). The persecution of the Christians as in Justin, yet the *pressura magna* is still looked for, 1, 4, 2; 1, 2, 3. Schwegler fixes upon the time of Trajan; Hilgenfeld, that of Hadrian; Volkmar, A.D. 130—135.

unites the church into one body.[1] The fourth Gospel is recalled to mind not only by the Shepherd's images—the flock, the door, the food of the word—and by his contrasts between life and death, truth and falsehood, and the exhortation to sin no more, but more particularly by the historical statement: Christ has made known the way of life by giving us a law which he received from the Father.[2] From these facts we draw yet another conclusion. One of the first great Gnostics, Basilides, who, according to Eusebius, flourished under Hadrian (117—138), made use, according to the *Philosophoumena*, of John's prologue and the marriage at Cana; and this discovery has been as often eagerly made use of from Jacobi to Tischendorf, as it has been contested from Zeller to Volkmar. In the first place, it is certain that the *Philosophoumena* repeatedly and distinctly introduce the Johannine quotations of Basilides, and of no other—"he says," and not "they say," as it would have been were the writer quoting Isidore and the chorus of successors; and if the possibility of some confusion is admitted—though the evidence of such confusion is weak—yet the fact remains sufficiently clear that the fourth Gospel actually existed in the time of Basilides, and that the Gnostics—masters and scholars—eagerly laid hold of the book.[3]

Thus far, our position has been almost that of the warmest defenders of the antiquity of this Gospel. The testimony in its

[1] Custodite mandata neque deinceps peccetis (John v. 14); hæc mandata facile custodies et non erunt dura (2, 12, 3); intelligetis, quod nihil facilius est his mandatis neque dulcius neque mansuetius neque sanctius, 2, 12, 4, comp. 1 John v. 3. Nothing easier if a man has God in his heart, ib. and 1 John iii. 6, 9. This immanence prevents the devil from having any longer power or entrance, 2, 5, 2; 2, 12, 4, 5; 2, 7. Comp. 1 John iv. 4, v. 18; John xiii. 27, xiv. 30.

[2] 3, 5, 6: Monstravit itinera vitæ data eis lege, quam a patre acceperat—completely the standpoint of the fourth Gospel.

[3] *Philosoph.* 7, 22, 27.; Eus. 4, 6 sq.; comp. Weizsäcker, p. 232. Volkmar (p. 71) thinks that the remark, ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις, clearly shows a completed canon from the end of the century; but has not Justin also already the same, and had they not *the Gospels* under Hadrian?

favour goes back as far as Justin and Barnabas, as far as the year 120: what older, better evidence have we for the Synoptics? Let us now, however, notice a distinction. The use made of the fourth Gospel was for a long time a more cautious, more sparing one, than that made of the earlier Gospels. Volkmar, perhaps, goes too far when he says that the new Gospel was found to be clever and interesting, but was not recognized as an authority; for the Clementine Homilies always introduce their Johannine quotations most reverently with such phrases as: The teacher, the prophet, has so spoken. We cannot fail to notice, however, a certain timidity in the use of the new source, which requires explanation. The Epistle of Barnabas delights in this peculiar system of thought, to which it is ever alluding, but it does not venture on direct and frank quotation: it makes but slight use of particulars, and avoids the doctrine of the Logos and the Paraclete, and of the already present kingdom. Justin Martyr and the Clementine Homilies make a far greater use of other sources, including our Synoptics, even where John almost forces himself upon their notice; and in the most important questions of the life of Jesus,—e.g., concerning the duration of the ministry, and his manner of teaching by short parables,—they have paid no attention to the contradiction of the fourth Gospel. Papias is silent as to this Gospel, possibly even openly blames it, highly as he prizes the Epistle.[1] The interest felt in this at present so highly esteemed Gospel became deeper towards the close of the century, and, which is remarkable, not without the hearty support of the condemned Gnosticism, until it not only acquired an equal rank with, but even a position of pre-eminence over, the earlier sources, as we can find in Tatian, Justin's scholar (171—175), in the Muratorian Fragment (cir.

[1] Comp. Justin, *Ap.* i. 63, the non-recognition of Jesus by the Jews, from Matt. xi., instead of John viii. 19, xvi. 3, at first-hand. The one-year's ministry, *Clementine Hom.* 17, 19; the short parables, Justin, above, p. 175. Papias, Eus. 3, 39: *οὐ γὰρ τοῖς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν ἔχαιρον ὥσπερ οἱ πολλοί, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τ' αληθῆ διδάσκουσι, οὐδὲ τοῖς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολὰς μνημονεύουσι, κ. τ. λ.* Undoubtedly it is possible that these words refer only to the Gnosis.

180), in Theophilus, Irenæus, and the other Fathers.[1] The reason for this delay in the acceptance of the fourth Gospel existed chiefly in its later origin; and this Gospel made a way for itself among the earlier, longer, used and esteemed records, as slowly as, and even more slowly than, did Luke or Mark with reference to Matthew. The earliest Fathers, without exception, have admitted that the origin of this Gospel, even if not precisely in the time of the Emperor Trajan, was nevertheless later than that of the others.[2] Another reason for the delay in its acceptance is to be found in the great divergence of its contents from the Synoptics—in its Christology, and perhaps still more, as can be seen from Justin and Papias, in its eschatology. Finally, it is evident from Irenæus, that there existed an aversion to the new "spirit,"—the spirit that seemed to find a caricature in the new revelations of the Montanists. The doubts about this Gospel are mentioned in the first Passover controversy, and especially by Irenæus; and Epiphanius, later, speaks of the angry opposition of the Alogi to the "lying Gospel." How many objections had to be removed is still more clearly seen from the numerous justifications of it, and explanations of its origin and of its relation to the Synoptics, in the Muratorian Fragment, in Irenæus and Clement, down to Eusebius and his successors.[3] The most

[1] Tatian wrote his Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας, which exhibits a great preference for this Gospel, after Justin's death (cir. A.D. 166), and at a time when the people were urging the State to a fresh persecution of the Christians (cap. 4), *i.e.* before A.D. 176, and under the sole rule of Marcus Aurelius (*i.e.* A.D. 171—175).

[2] Indeed it is called the last Gospel, Ἰωάννης ἔσχατος, Clem. ap. Eus. 6, 14 (Jerome, *Cat.* 9: Novissimus omnium). Irenæus merely says that John lived until Trajan's time in Ephesus; but he does not say when he wrote the Gospel (5, 30, 3), whether before or after the Apocalypse, which was assumed to have been written under Domitian (5, 30, 3). He points, however, to a late date (3, 11, 1) in his remark as to the Gospel's being directed against Cerinthus and the *earlier* Nicolaitans.

[3] Comp. Passover controversy, Apoll. in *Chron. Pasch.* Dind. 1, 13 sq. Iren. *Haer.* 3, 11, 9: Alii, ut donum spir. frustrentur, illam speciem non admittunt, quæ est sec. Joannis ev., in qua Paracletum se missurum dominus promisit. Sed simul et evangelium et prophet. repellunt spiritum. Infelices vere, qui pseudoprophetas quidem esse volunt, proph. vero gratiam repellunt ab ecclesia, similia patientes his, qui propter eos, qui in hypocrisi veniunt, etiam a fratrum communione abstinent. When logically considered, it is, as Bleek and Ritschl also see, unquestionable that instead

interesting notice of it is the long *excursus* of the Muratorian Fragment, which defends the book as the work of an eye-witness, and—the defender passing into the encomiast—extols it as the universal Gospel, as the Gospel which, in contrast with the one-sided ones, was all-sided, and had the sanction of all the Apostles: hence, according to yet later authorities, numerous embassies were sent to John to obtain it of him by their entreaties.[1]

The external evidences prove that the fourth Gospel had its origin in the beginning of the second century, without doubt under the Emperor Trajan, between A.D. 100—117; yet so late after the Synoptics, and especially after the chief of the Synoptics, that it was with great difficulty it could make its own way in spite of the authority of the Gospels that were already established in the churches.

There are several *internal* indications of date in the book itself: the position occupied by Christianity, here and there betrayed, and those peculiar ideas in the work that enable us to detect its date.

The church is no longer composed of the generation of the apostolic age. The complete fusion of the long-since out-of-date utterances of Jesus concerning his coming again, the conversion of the coming again into a coming of the Spirit and a reception into heaven, plainly point to a later age which can no longer use and apply the old sayings, and which consoles itself with spiritual possessions and a heavenly inheritance. The waning of the belief in the second coming—in retaining which belief Justin felt isolated enough—can be traced in the second century as early

of Text. Rec. *pseudo-prophetæ prophetas* must be read, whereby the empty hypotheses concerning Montanist opponents of the Gospel fall to the ground; in reality, many persons, on account of the Montanist abuses, rejected not only the Spirit, but also the Gospel of the Spirit. At the same time, it is a fact that the Montanists appealed to Synoptic passages for their prophets, namely, to Matt. xxiii. 34 (Anon. ap. Eus. 5, 16), as also did their opponents to Matt. xxiv. 24, although they appear also to have made use of John (xvi. 8) in their conception of the *πνεῦμα ἐλεγκτικόν*. Epiph. *Haer.* 51, 3 (comp. De Wette, *Einl.* 6th ed. p. 227). Eus. 3, 24.

[1] Ut recognoscentibus *cunctis* (apostolis) Johannes suo nomine *cuncta* describeret, &c.

as in the first Epistle of Clement, the Epistle of Polycarp, and even in a New Testament book (2 Pet. iii. 4): Luke and Mark offer the first consolation; the Epistle to the Hebrews and the first Epistle of Clement—of the same date as the Epistle of Barnabas—offer the second.[1] The Apostles, therefore, as a matter of course, have disappeared from the stage; they are referred to as slain by the Jews, received up by their Lord; and the teaching and prayers of the Lord comprehend not only them, but also (as in Mark) the church which they have brought into the faith.[2] The spurious appendix to the Gospel (ch. xxi.) takes it for granted that not merely Peter, but even the Apostle who was to remain until the Lord came, had passed away.[3] Jerusalem, also, is no more; the prediction of Jesus that prayer should cease to be offered in the temple, and the prediction of the high-priest Caiaphas, that the Romans should come and take away their place and nation, are of special significance to the author, because he is a witness of their fulfilment.[4] Christianity is widely diffused, is reaping rich harvests in the world and among the Hellenes; and as the apostolic representative of the latter, Philip can appear (perhaps because the confounding of him with the deacon of the Acts of the Apostles had already begun to take place).[5] Nor is there wanting the tribulation which Mark had also represented as in store for the kingdom of God, though it comes rather from the Jews than from the Gentiles.[6] The one united Church is composed of Hellenes and Jews, whose future union had been foreseen by Jesus; but as the Hellenes are the more numerous, their principles have also the ascendency—the Church worships the Father without law, without temple, in spirit, and no longer eats the Jewish Passover lamb with the

[1] Justin, above, p. 190. Polyc. *ad. Philipp.* 7: ὃς ἂν λέγῃ, μήτε ἀνάστασιν μήτε κρίσιν εἶναι, οὗτος πρωτότοκός ἐστι τοῦ σατανᾶ. 1 Clem. 23: πόρρω γενέσθω ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη, ὅπου λέγει. ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ δίψυχοι οἱ λέγοντες. ταῦτα ἠκούσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ ἰδοὺ γεγηράκημεν καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῖν τούτων συμβέβηκε. Heavenly home, comp. 1 Clem. 5; *Ep. ad Diogn.* 5, &c.

[2] John xvi. 2, xiv. 3, xvii. 20. [3] xxi. 22, 23. [4] iv. 21 sqq., xi. 48.

[5] iv. 35 sqq., xii. 20 sq.; Acts viii. 4 sqq. [6] xvii. 23, xvi. 2.

people.[1] Yet Judaism is treated with consideration—a higher union of the conflicting churches is attained: of the Apostle Paul by the side of the Twelve, there is no trace; and the spiritual rule of Christianity is called by the Jewish name of the new commandment, the new law.[2]

All these features harmonize with the second century, and indeed with its beginning. The time of Trajan is most strongly suggested by the total disappearance — mentioned by Hegissippus—of the old witnesses of the life of Jesus, by the extensive diffusion of Christianity, and by the mildness of the scarcely begun heathen persecution.[3] To this may be added the commencement of the union of Jews and Gentiles in the Church, a union based on the abrogation of the old Law and the introduction of the new, and described in a strikingly similar manner—and not without a renunciation of the Apostle Paul—in the documents belonging to the beginning of the second century, such as Barnabas and the first of Clement.[4]

The system of thought peculiar to this Gospel affords fresh light, which enables us to obtain a deep insight into the situation of the time. We will notice only the central point. This lies within the province of Christology. Jesus, the true Son of God, the glorious One who existed before the world, the Logos of God—this fundamental conception of the Gospel has its roots in the apostolic age, with Paul; but in the prominence given to its metaphysical element, in the combination of the metaphysical and the historical, in the stress laid upon the incarnation as a phenomenal form with divine contents, this Christology of the fourth Gospel suggests a more advanced standpoint, and reminds

[1] Comp. iv. 21 sqq., x. 16, xviii. 28.

[2] Comp. vi. 70 (*οἱ δώδεκα*); xiii. 34, *ἐντολὴν καινήν*.

[3] Heges. ap. Eus. 3, 32. Conversions under Trajan, even of Jews, Eus. 3, 35. Plin. ad Traj. (10, 97): Neque enim civitates tantum, sed vicos etiam atque agros superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est (comp. John iv. 35).

[4] *καινὸς νόμος*, Barn. 2 = *ἐντολὴ καινή*, John xiii. 34. *λαὸς καινὸς*, Barn. 7; comp. John x. 16, xi. 52. As to 1 Clem., comp. Hilgenfeld, *Apost. Väter*, 1853, pp. 86 sqq. Comp. especially Ritschl, *Altkath. Kirche*, 2nd ed. pp. 274 sqq.

us of the Epistle to the Hebrews—the date of which is much later than is usually supposed—of the Preaching of Peter, the first Epistle of Clement, and most of all, as we have already seen, of the Epistle of Barnabas; while the theory of the expounders of the Logos—Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and the Epistles of Ignatius—especially in its refutation of the doctrine of the merely apparent humanity of Jesus, lies evidently much nearer our own times.[1] But the clearest view of the time in which the Gospel was written is obtained when we examine more narrowly the motive, aim and meaning, of this higher Christology. The first Epistle of John can throw light upon this point. Whether it be thought earlier or later than the Gospel (we adhere firmly to the opinion of the earliest critic, Dionysius of Alexandria, that it is to be ascribed to the same author), in any case it is allied to the Gospel as to time, and essentially as to its spirit, and we are fully justified in believing that one and the same motive gave rise to both.[2] The Gospel, however, confines itself to laying before its readers with special emphasis, faith in Jesus as the Son of God. The Epistle contains the reason for this solemn exposition of the great confession; it sets forth the danger, the fermentation, the brooding, of the time which, on the one hand, comes into collision with the

[1] The apparent existence of the temple, in the Epistle to the Hebrews (the present tense similarly used in Jos. *Con. Ap.* 1, 7; 2, 23; in the Epistle of Barnabas, 7; 1 Clem. 40 sq.; Justin, *Tryph.* 107), is simply no ground for referring back beyond the second century the advanced, minutely elaborated dogmatism of that Epistle, which dogmatism is accompanied by so many other evidences of date. The Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Gospel of John, stand in one line of Alexandrian development. The Preaching of Peter: ἐν τῷ Π. κ. εὕροις ἂν νόμον καὶ λόγον τὸν κύριον προσαγορευόμενον, Clem. *Strom.* 1, 29. *Mur. Frag.* 58. The refutation of the doctrine of the Docetæ in Ignatius is much more developed: Jesus truly born of the house of David, of Mary; he ate, drank, was baptized, truly suffered, &c. Comp. *Ad Trall.* 9; *Smyrn.* 2, 3. 7. Also Holtzmann, on the address of the Epistle to the Hebrews, *Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift*, 1867, p. 9, brings down the date of the Epistle below the year 70. But so long as the date is not brought down to the time of the fourth Gospel, the time of Barnabas and Clement (in accordance with Eusebius himself), justice is not done to the contents of the Epistle.

[2] The differences (comp. Baur, Hilgenfeld) can be reconciled, for traces at least of eschatology are not wanting to the more idealistic standpoint of the Gospel. Conception and language are too identical. Dion. ap. Eus. 7, 25.

Son of God, but, on the other hand, has need of him, if it is not to lose the blessing of Christianity—communion with God, life, heaven. In spite of all the empty assurances of commentators, there is not an iota to be erased from the truth (which also Godet recognizes) that the Gospel defends the doctrine of the Son of God thetically, the Epistle antithetically. In what consisted the true doctrine,—in what consisted the denial, of the Son of God, at the time of the great apologist? The Epistle speaks plainly. There is a spirit of error in the world, spirits have gone forth from the Church, born, not of God, but of the world and the devil, spirits that are gladly listened to by the world because they are of the world and speak worldly things; and though they are resisted and shunned by believers, yet they are most dangerous deceivers, in fact veritable Antichrists, many Antichrists, a sign of the supreme crisis, the last hour. They deny that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God—the solemn confession of faith of the Gospel; and again, they deny that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.[1] There is therefore a two-fold denial, a denial which passes from the lower to the higher, from the historical to the metaphysical, and *vice versâ:* the historical man, the son of Joseph and Mary, does not possess a divine and eternal nature; and the divine, eternal being, the Son of God, the Christ from above, has not become flesh, has not become an earthly man. It is therefore no lower Christology, but rather a lofty, divided, and dualistic one, a severing of the divine and human in the person of Jesus, a man who is not God, a God who refuses to be a man.

There can be no doubt as to the name of this historical phenomenon. We cannot (with Jerome, Epiphanius, De Wette, Lücke, and Bleek) regard it as mere Ebionitism, with a lower view of the person of Jesus; for the contested Christology was of a low

[1] 1 John iv. 3 sqq., ii. 18 sq. The denial that Jesus is the Christ or the Son of God, ii. 22, v. 1, iv. 15, v. 5, 10 sqq. Or that Christ has appeared in the flesh, iii. 1, iv. 2; 2 John 7. The world, iv. 4 sq., iii. 7, v. 5. Danger, iv. 4 sqq., ii. 26, iii. 7, iv. 1. Laxity, iii. 7, iv. 4 sq., v. 5. Comp. Brückner, *Comm. De Wette's*, p. xviii: All polemical tendencies are imaginary. Similarly Meyer.

character in only one aspect; while, again, Ebionitism, with its genuinely Jewish human Christ, continued to lead—as Justin and Irenæus show—a harmless and peaceable existence in the Church, until, at the end of the second century, there arose the more theoretical, cultured, and aggressive school of the Theodotians.[1] The Epistle speaks plainly enough: to the reader that cannot discover for himself the name of these Christologists and dualists, the Epistle cries, "Whosoever saith, I *know* him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar." These are the "Gnostics" of the second century—this is the mighty and threatening phenomenon of the *Gnosis*, which was derived from Paul as well as from Jewish Christianity.[2] There is nothing to hinder us from supposing, but rather everything to require us to suppose, that we are here looking upon its earliest development; for the antitheses are everywhere definite and simple, whereas later they became more diffuse and detailed; and the Epistle itself reveals the novelty of the position, and the antagonistic phenomena are for the first time in contact with each other.[3] According to the testimony of Hegesippus, Gnosticism made its first appearance in the time of the Emperor Trajan (according to Clement of Alexandria, under Hadrian); and one of its most influential leaders, according to Irenæus, was Cerinthus, who, as Irenæus and others later—e g. Jerome—have maintained, was at that time actively teaching in Asia Minor and Ephesus.[4] Cerinthus taught, on the basis of Alexandrian premises, a dualistic God, a dualistic Christ; the world was made, not by the supreme God, but by a subordinate power; Jesus was the son of Joseph

[1] Jerome, *Catal.* 9: Joannes novissimus omnium scripsit evangelium, adversus Cerinthum aliosque hæreticos et maxime tunc *Ebionitarum* dogma consurgens. Comp. Credner, *Einl.* p. 244. Interesting points of resemblance to the Artemonites and Theodotians, *Eus.* 5, 28. Comp. also the Ebionites, *Philos.* 7, 34.

[2] ii. 4, iv. 8.

[3] *Now* is the Antichrist, they have gone out from us, 1 John ii. 18 sq.

[4] Heges. ap. Eus. 3, 32. Iren. 3, 11, 1: Joannes domini discipulus volens per ev. annunciationem auferre eum, qui a *Cerintho* inseminatus erat hominibus errorem et prius ab his, qui dicuntur Nicolaitæ, &c. Comp. Jerome, *Cat.* 9.

and Mary, born like other men, but superior in righteousness and wisdom. At his baptism, the Christ, the spiritual and the passionless, descended upon him in the form of a dove from the supreme God, qualifying him to proclaim the unknown God and to work miracles; but departing from him in his passion, so that it was only Jesus, and not the Christ, who suffered and rose again.[1] Notwithstanding the stress which he laid upon the spiritual Christ, Cerinthus at the same time, as a true Jewish Christian, inculcated the belief in a millennial kingdom of God in Jerusalem, full of nuptial joy; and Dionysius of Alexandria called not only his opinions, but Cerinthus himself, exceedingly "carnal," and ascribed the seductive influence of his doctrine to this carnality.[2] Let us now turn to the Epistle and the Gospel. They form a manifest, acute, and comprehensive answer to this Cerinthus: Jesus is the Christ, the Christ is Jesus; the Christ from above possesses divine glory, and is as such also the creator of the world; but the Christ from above is also indistinguishable from the earthly one, is not distinct from Jesus, but one and the same, does not come and go like a bird through the air, but enters the flesh and dwells in it, and dies; but he fills the earth, flesh and blood, the whole person of Jesus which is himself, and not only the person of Jesus but also the believers, who are born of God and not of worldly lust—he fills all, through life and death and resurrection, with divine life and glory. Thus from this opposition to the dualism of Cerinthus—an opposition partly also to his exaggerated spirituality, that passes over into carnality—the meaning and purpose of the Gospel receive their ultimate explanation. The Evangelist also "knows" and is a "Gnostic" who is quite ready to confess to the highest and boldest speculations concerning the Christ from above, the mani-

[1] Iren. 1, 26, 1. *Philos.* 7, 7, 33; 10, 21. Egyptian culture, ib. (thrice). Against Lipsius, Gnosis, Ersch, and Gruber. John xii. 28 may be regarded as directed against the *revolans in fine Christus de Jesu;* the δόξα Θεοῦ appears also in the *passio.*

[2] Dion. Alex. ap. Eus. 3, 28: ὧν αὐτὸς ὠρέγετο φιλοσώματος ὢν καὶ πάνυ σαρκικός.

festation of the invisible God; but he will cancel the false distinction, the Gnostic Docetism (apparent humanity), which threatens the person of Christ, the unity of God and the world, and which robs the world of the Father and the Son. The Evangelist argues as an Alexandrian against the Alexandrian; and while he remains nearer to Philo, he yet passes beyond Philo, preaching the perfect, indwelling God whom his religion preaches to him, though his understanding can only lessen, not solve, the contradictions. It is a confirmation of this assumption that Irenæus knows that the Gospel was directed against Cerinthus (and at the same time against the legendary Nicolaitans), and that in many ways the Church connects the names of Cerinthus and John.[1]

Several recent representatives of the critical school have found in this Gospel references not merely to Cerinthus, or, as Baur would have it, to Gnosticism in general, but also to the later great Gnostic systems, to the teaching of Valentinus and Marcion. Hilgenfeld explains the Gospel as a result of the influence of the Valentinian Gnosticism at the time of its transition into that of Marcion; and Volkmar connects it with both schools, especially with that of Marcion.[2] But these conjectures are shattered by chronology. If, as we saw, Valentinus flourished between 140—160, and Marcion was at his zenith about 160, the Gospel, according to all appearances, was already in circulation. If, then, in order to make it probable that the Gospel refers to Valentinus, we are reminded of Valentinus' doctrine of the Logos, of his most exalted conceptions of the Only-begotten, the Truth, the Life, the Paraclete, and several other similar

[1] Comp. not only the anecdote of the meeting of Cerinthus and John in the baths at Ephesus (Iren. 3, 3, 4), but also the legend mentioned by Dion. Alex. in the third century, that Cerinthus was the author of the Revelation, and had affixed John's name to it (Eus. 3, 28). In the same manner the so-called Alogi of Epiph. ascribed the Johannine writings to Cerinthus. *Haer.* 51, 3.

[2] Comp. Hilgenfeld, *Das Ev. und die Briefe Johannis nach ihrem Lehrbegriff*, 1849; *Die Evangelien*, 1854, pp. 332 sqq. Volkmar, *Religion Jesu*, 1857, pp. 433 sqq.; *Ursprung*, p. 153.

terms, of the means by which God passes over into the world, and of the apparent humanity of Christ; it is, on the other hand, palpably clear that John stands far removed from the metaphysical dualism which lies at the foundation of this grand yet fantastical doctrinal edifice, and far removed from this wearisome infinity of emanations—that he knows neither the pleroma, nor the æons, nor the hermaphrodite pairs, nor the tedious machinery of the contradictory passing of God into the finite; it is clear, therefore, that he is much more ancient, and that, as Irenæus intimates, he himself assisted to lay the foundation of this superstructure. If it be said, with Hilgenfeld, that the author of the Gospel undertook the work of simplifying this Gnosticism, we reply, that this work could obviously be undertaken only in the decline of Gnosticism, and therefore much later, and must have assumed an altogether different form, inasmuch as the Logos conception in Valentinianism had not, from any point of view, the commanding position which it found in the Gospel.[1] A reference in the Gospel to the later Marcion would be more credible; for he rejected the endless birth of the æons, and assumed only the duality of a good and of a righteous God as the divine powers of the world, and proclaimed the triumph of the first over the second, over the God of the Jews and his restricted commandment. But where does John set forth an opposition between a God who is good and a God who is righteous? Where does he, as we are told, describe Judaism as the kingdom of essential darkness? Does he not rather say that the One God, nay, the Logos himself, sent Moses and the prophets,

[1] Irenæus has already called attention to the latter fact by saying: (among the Gnostics) Initium quidem esse Monogenem, Logon autem verum filium Unigeniti, 3, 11, 1. Irenæus held that the Valentinians were *objectively* refuted by the Gospel; but nothing is said of direct reference. Contrary to Volkmar, pp. 152 sq. On the subject of the Monistic development in Gnosticism, comp. Marcion in relation to the earlier Gnosticism, Apelles in relation to Marcion, the book *Pistis Sophia* in relation to the earlier Ophitism. Comp. Köstlin, *Das Gnost. System des Buches Pistis Sophia*, *Theol. Jahrbb.*, 1854.

but that the nation had refused to understand the eternal purposes of the One God? The untenableness of the theory in question becomes fully apparent, when that theory is made to give to individual passages—such as the famous John viii. 44—a Gnostic-Valentinic-Marcionic sense. If, in the above passage, Jesus had declared that the Jews were of their father the devil, the Gnostic Demiurge, and were eager to do his lusts, then would the Demiurge not only have been introduced in a most wonderful manner, but he would also have had given to him a character altogether opposed to that ascribed to him by Valentinus and Marcion, since in their view he was not the lustful, lying, men-murdering colleague of the devil, but his opposite, the representative of right and order. Such artificial and forced interpretations have delivered the opponents of liberal science from their dread of modern criticism.[1]

Nevertheless, this school has made unusually acute attempts to unravel all the historical complications connected with this closing Gospel; and Baur thought to crown these attempts with his proof of the essential *rapport* of this Gospel with all the great phenomena of the second century,—his chase after four or five hares at once, as Godet was pleased to say.[2] Thus, Schwegler, following Baur's suggestions, has pronounced this Gospel to be a spiritualistic precipitate from the Montanistic movement, the great contemporary of Gnosticism in the storm-and-stress period of the Church, the practical by the side of the theoretical; while, at the same time, Volkmar and others have called the Montanists opponents of the new Gospel.[3] There exists however, between the Gospel of the Spirit and the inspired prophets of the Spirit of God in Phrygia, an inner connection; and this inner connection became even an outward one through the ecclesiastical suspicion in which, according to Irenæus, Montanism involved the Gospel with which it—Montan-

[1] Comp. Hilgenfeld, *Ev.* pp. 331 sqq.

[2] P. 29.

[3] Comp. Volkmar, *Rel. J.* pp. 441 sq.; *Hippolytus*, pp. 112 sqq.

ism—had some affinity.[1] Passing by a number of points of resemblance which are first historically exhibited by the much later Montanism of Tertullian (A.D. 200), the original Montanism proclaimed the Spirit, the equal, if not indeed identical, representative of the Father and of the Son, the judge and comforter (Paraclete), the revealer of the future, inculcated a breach with the world, and virginity with reference to the world, and mentioned also the name of Philip, of the forerunner in spirit and purity from the world; and Maximilla, the prophetess, said, in sentences that remind us of John: I am kept away from the sheep, like a wolf; I am no wolf, I am word, and spirit, and power.[2] Certain passages, also, in John (xv. 26, 27) might appear to be corrections of the original exaggerations. But chronology decides this point also. So far as we can trace, the obscure beginnings of Montanism make their appearance in the middle of the century; its first great successes, by which it aroused the attention of the Christian world, were gained in the time of the persecutions under the Emperor Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 166—180), at the end of whose reign its first great leaders depart from the scene: this was an age in which the fourth Gospel was already in existence,—an age, moreover, in which Montanism had not yet passed into its soberer phase, for that, as can be proved, belongs to the close of the century.[3]

[1] Comp. Irenæus, 3, 11, 9. See the passage and its correct rendering, above, p. 198.

[2] Eus. 5, 16. Comp. generally the old documents in Eus. 5, 14—19; also 5, 1. Tertullian gives exceedingly interesting gleanings, *Præscr.* 52. *Philos.* 8, 19. Epiph. *Haer.* 48 sq. Comp. also Ritschl, *Altkath. Kirche*, 2nd ed. pp. 488 sqq. Volkmar, *Hippolytus*, pp. 45, 104.

[3] Schwegler, *Der Montanismus*, 1841, fixes its origin A.D. 140—150; Mosheim, A.D. 150; Walch, A.D. 170; Cave, A.D. 180. Ritschl assents to the chronology of Schwegler, although many things require fresh investigation. For example, Schwegler has plainly confounded the anti-Montanist Apollonius with the martyr in Rome under Commodus, and has drawn chronological conclusions from the date of this reign. The *obscure beginnings* may be assigned to about the year 150, or (with Apollonius, who writes between A.D. 170—180 and has a knowledge of forty years) as early as the year 140. Eus. 5, 18. Comp. Epiph., at one place A.D. 135, at another A.D. 157. It is in favour of this date that the Montanists claimed spiritual succession from Quadratus (5, 17), under Hadrian (4, 3, opp. 23). But the great Montanist suc-

Further, there is simply nothing to show that the conception of the Spirit, the Paraclete, is the spontaneous production of Montanism, in which there was so little that was theoretical, but so much that was purely and crudely practical. Montanism itself points out its predecessors, and it received its conceptions from those predecessors or from the surrounding church, which might already have come under the influence of the fourth Gospel. It is, finally, most improbable that a Gospel which, in its spirituality, stands in diametrical opposition to Montanism with its deeply imprinted materialism and grossness both in its worship and in its hopes as to the future, should have derived its inspiration from a phenomenon that met with the most vehement opposition from the far less ideal intellects of the Church. There is, therefore, far more reason for bringing this Gospel's conception of the Spirit into connection with Paul and his theory of the Church, and, later on, with the views of its more immediate contemporaries—the first Epistle of Clement and the Epistle of Barnabas—and, again, for bringing its new conception of the Paraclete into connection with the great doctrinal teacher Philo, than for deriving either conception from Gnosticism or Montanism.

In the same way, it is possible to disprove the relation which Baur has found between the day upon which the fourth Gospel makes the death of Jesus take place, and the controversies about Easter which arose in Asia Minor in the second half of the second century. Those controversies first make their appearance about the year 160, at a time when the Gospel had long

cesses were not before A.D. 160—180. Justin is not acquainted with them (*Tryph.* 82, 87); the appearance of the famous prophetess Maximilla did not occur until the time of the persecution at Smyrna (5, 18, 24), *i.e.* A.D. 166, and her death—according to the Anon. Eus., who wrote his second book about the year 193—not until A.D. 180 (5, 16, 17). At that time Montanus and Priscilla were already dead, ib. Hence the party cry appears still quite fresh in the year 177 (ἄρτι τότε πρῶτον), 5, 3. Miltiades and Apollinaris, who addressed apologies to Marcus Aurelius, together with Melito and Athenagoras (cir. A.D. 177), also then first wrote (in the beginning of the Montanist successes, says Eusebius) against the Montanists (4, 26, 27); and Bishop Soter of Rome (A.D. 170—177), *Prædest. haer.* 26, 86. Also Celsus, who was acquainted with them (7, 9), wrote about A.D. 177. Comp. Eus. *Chron.* A.D. 172.

been in existence: hence the Gospel also became entangled in the prevailing strife about the year 170. To establish Baur's view, it would have first to be shown that the controversy dates much further back, and that the position assumed by the Gospel, so easily explained from Paul and from a desire to get rid of the Law, stands in connection with such a controversy. The actual connection is simply this, viz. that the later controversy found its point of support in the Gospel itself, and derived nourishment from the general Gentile-Christian striving after freedom.

Whilst therefore the ancients, and recently Ewald and Weizsäcker—besides Tischendorf, who thinks that the four Gospels "must" all have been in existence soon after the destruction of Jerusalem—have fixed the origin of the fourth Gospel at the close of the first century, and the Tübingen school, with many minor diversities of date, has fixed it in the early part of the second half of the second century (A.D. 160—170), we maintain that, according to all appearance, the correct date is the beginning of the second century, the time of the Emperor Trajan, in whose reign John is said by Irenæus to have been still alive,—therefore about A.D. 110—115.[1]

η.—*Author.*

Ecclesiastical antiquity has almost unanimously ascribed this Gospel to the Apostle John. But it must not be overlooked that this assertion first appears at the end of the second century (Theophilus, cir. A.D. 180); and that the earliest detailed account of this authorship—an account belonging to the same period—in the Muratorian Fragment, is already of a legendary character.

Many things may appear to favour the supposition that the author was an Apostle, and that that Apostle was John: the

[1] Tischendorf, *Wann wurden uns. Ev. verfasst?* 1865, p. 49. Volkmar's refutation of this work (*Urspr. uns. Ev.* 1866), is, as regards facts, conclusive on many points. He fixes the date at A.D. 150—160.

Hebraic colouring of the language, which really does not betray a Gentile Christian in the sense of Baur and his followers, the author's knowledge of the Old Testament in the original language, his acquaintance with Jewish customs and places and also with the separate details of the Messianic idea, which latter fact Weizsäcker thinks particularly significant; but, above all, the intimation of the author's having been an eye-witness, together with the much-lauded clearness of perception of facts, the bold and unhesitating contradiction of other traditions, and the spirit of fire and love which seems to be in character with the beloved disciple, the son of thunder. Nor are there wanting in the Gospel points of contact with the later history of John as that history has been, on the authority of Irenæus, generally related since the end of the second century,—points of contact with the residence in Asia Minor, in Ephesus, in the metropolis of Paulinism. We have here the Evangelist of the Dispersion, the advocate of the rights of the Greeks, the herald of the abolition of the Law, the opponent of the errors of Cerinthus as they had appeared in the church of Ephesus in Asia Minor.

Our belief, however, that an Apostle was the author of this Gospel has been very much weakened by the foregoing discussion. Could an Apostle go in the footsteps of Luke and Mark; or could he so considerably and so arbitrarily alter the correct tradition concerning Jesus, and instead of holding fast the most faithful reminiscences, transform his reminiscences into a mere coloured play of fancy? Could an Apostle in the second century, broken down by age, write a Gospel so full to overflowing with life and spirit, so serviceable to the age? Did an Apostle still survive, although the Revelation of John, about A.D. 70, and the Luke-Mark Gospel, between A.D. 80—100, already believe the Apostles to be dead?[1] Moreover, the traces in this

[1] Against the survival of any of the Apostles, which has been believed in from the time of Irenæus, there is the fact that Hegesippus, as early as the reign of Domitian, could only with difficulty point out (and that as something remarkable) *grandchildren* of Judas the brother of Jesus (Eus. 3, 20). At the same time, it is true, he calls Simeon, the bishop of Jerusalem, who (as well as the grandchildren) died under

Gospel of an eye-witness, of a John, are very faint. This has long been observed, although even at the present day Godet passes lightly over it. In the first place, the expressions—"we beheld his glory," &c.—in the beginning of the Gospel (i. 14) as well as in the Epistle, are such as every Christian could make use of. But where the eye-witness is an individual (as in xix. 35), it is very remarkable that his statements are supported by a long attestation; and that in the spurious addition (xxi. 24) this attestation is repeated by a third person, who is sharply distinguished from the eye-witness: hence, after the long disputes about the passage, xix. 35, Weizsäcker also has abandoned this proof, and even Ewald finds, in the principal passage, the testimony not so much of John himself as of his secretary,—in short, of the third person. This reticence as to the eye-witness, which Bretschneider had already noticed, may show that the author could not boast of being himself an eye-witness, that he merely derived his information from one, perhaps merely appealed to an eye-witness in order to have the support of a great name in bringing forth his view of the entrance of God into the world,—a view which was not only novel and lofty, but also even true to actual life.[1] This reticence is exhibited as to the mention of the name itself. John is nowhere directly declared to be the author, except in the appendix, where the third person speaks of him; in the Gospel he is so slightly and obscurely alluded to, that the Church scarcely found here ground upon which to build its faith in John's authorship. Whilst even Luthardt, in a critical mood,

Trajan, a cousin of Jesus (Eus. 3, 32); but he is unacquainted with any surviving Apostle. To him, the Apostles, and indeed the eye-witnesses generally, had then, and in the beginning of the success of Gnosticism, essentially *died out*, ib.

[1] Comp. Ewald, pp. 48 sqq. Weizsäcker, pp. 238 sq. The passage, xix. 35, gave occasion to an interesting controversy as to the use of the pronoun ἐκεῖνος (that one!), chiefly between Hilgenfeld and A. Buttmann (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1860) on the one side, and Steitz, the defender of the Evangelist as an eye-witness, on the other (*ib.* 1859, pp. 497 sqq., and again in 1861). Comp. Hilg. *Zeitschrift*, 1859, pp. 414 sqq.; 1860, pp. 505 sqq.; 1861, pp. 313 sqq.; 1862, pp. 204 sq. Also Hilg. *Kanon*, 1863, p. 230. It is less the language than a rational logic that forbids the identity of the subjects, this violent objectizing of the author-subject.

thought that John, under a consciousness of his extreme "subjectivity," wished to hide himself a little, this "modest" reserve of the author has been generally, up to the present day, prized as an evidence of complete and ancient genuineness: a forger would have made a show of John's name.[1] But does Ewald forget that one passage explains the other; and that the third person, who in the principal passage veils the author, had also elsewhere reason to veil him, the great unknown? Let it be seriously assumed that John, who is here and there in the Gospel briefly introduced, is not so introduced by a third person, but by the author himself: in that case, the author has introduced himself in a very striking manner as the specially beloved disciple of Jesus, preferred even before Peter, and has actually represented himself as Peter's patron and mediator, and as the solitary hero at the trial and at Golgotha.[2] The veil, therefore, over the relation between John and the author, is subtle and modest only so long as the author is not identical with the designedly and unhistorically magnified beloved disciple; if the two are one person, we have, as Weisze also saw, an instance of the most objectionable self-glorification, the moral condemnation of a vain Apostle.

We proceed further, and inquire more precisely into the relation between the Evangelist and the historical John. The most reliable authority concerning the Apostle John is the Apostle Paul. The latter does not leave it doubtful that John, as the third person with James and Peter, was a leading representative of the Jewish-Christian tendency in Jerusalem—the tendency which from principle, and more or less in opposition to Paul himself, had preached the Gospel only to the circumcision, i. e. in the forms of the Law and of the national privileges. This distinction in the Apostolate was confirmed and distinctly defined about the year 53, by the apostolic council; it was still in existence in the year 58, at the time of the Epistle to the Corin-

[1] Ewald, p. 48.

[2] Comp. only xiii. 23 sqq., xviii. 15 sqq., xix. 25 sqq., xx. 2 sqq.

thians; and even Paul's later Epistles show that it continued unchanged to the end of his ministry, and perhaps had become even more sharply pronounced.[1] It may be admitted that perhaps John attached himself to the milder tendency of Peter; and, still more probably, that in the decade from A.D. 50 to A.D. 60, subsequent to the apostolic council, he was engaged in mission work among the extra-Jerusalemitic, and perhaps also extra-Palestinian, Jews, a fact which is possibly alluded to in the first Epistle to the Corinthians.[2] But however cavalierly the latest theology may rush in advance of the results of modern criticism—which it calls obsolete and refuted, though the refuter has yet to appear—nevertheless the perpetually Jewish-Christian and legalistic attitude of the old Apostles, therefore also of John, even of Peter, who, under the influences of the past and of the Jerusalemitic present, recoiled from a decisive conversion to Paulinism, is one of the most incontestable results of the scientific investigation of the apostolic age; and this is admitted even by Lechler and Ritschl, in spite of their unhappy compromises.[3] Is it at all probable that, eventually, after the death of Paul or after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jewish-Christian Apostle should have gone over to Paulinism with drums beating and

[1] Comp. Gal. ii. 9 sq.; 1 Cor. i. 12, ix. 2 sqq., xv. 9 sqq. Of the later Epistles, comp. the Epistle to the Philippians, A.D. 63, 64, which exhibits Paul as quite isolated from the Jewish Christians, i. 15 sqq., iii. 2 sqq., &c. I wish to remark here that I do not identify these Apostles with the pharisaically-zealous Jerusalemites, but believe them to have been desirous of coming to an understanding with Paul; nor do I refer to them the expressions, "overmuch Apostles," and "false Apostles," of the second Epistle to the Corinthians. Hilgenfeld, however (*Zeitschrift*, 1865, p. 262), does so explain the "overmuch Apostles," and even speaks (p. 254) of the *failure* of the attempt at even a *tolerably* good understanding.

[2] 1 Cor. ix. 5.

[3] Read, on the other side, Bleek's weak and unhistorical account, *Einl.* p. 214. I hope, in a history of the apostolic age, to justify these representations with more exactness. So long as Ritschl and Lechler defend such statements as this, viz. that the Apostles were, *on principle*, *indifferent* towards the Law, and upheld it simply as an external national and social ordinance (comp. Ritschl, *Altkath. K.* 2nd ed. 1857, pp. 126 sqq.), so long are they in the wake not only of Neander (*Pflanzung*, 4th ed. p. 209), but also of Hofmann (*N. T.* I. 111).

colours flying; that, about the year 70, when he was certainly a sexagenarian, he should have broken with all the sacred principles of his youth, his manhood, and his ministry; that in the rending of Jewish bonds, he, by his opposition to the "Jews," who had become strangers both to him and to God, and by his opposition to "their Law"—that hopeless Law—should have outdone even the Apostle Paul, the isolated, reckless, and yet, both as to the nation and the Law, pious champion of freedom? Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty; there even that which is old undergoes a revolution and becomes new; but there never was a greater mockery of all history and of all psychological probability, than the notion of the conversion of a mature-aged Judaist into an Apostle of freedom who surpassed Paul, the one great historical individual that carried out his principles regardless of consequences,—this is a notion which makes sport of facts and dishonours an Apostle, while it marks the volatility of the character and principles of the moderns.

If we add to the evidence of Paul, that of the Revelation of John and of the Gospels of Luke and Mark, we have a conclusive proof that, up to the year 70 in the one case, and up to the year 100 in the other, John passed for an Apostle of strictly Jewish-Christian principles. It is not credible that the Revelation is the work of the Apostle John himself, and we cannot therefore, with the school of Baur, deduce from the evident and strict Jewish Christianity of that genuinely Johannine book the spuriousness of the so different Gospel; for the Revelation of John, the work of the "prophet," contains no characteristic to mark it as a work of the Apostle John.[1] But it assumes that the Twelve, therefore John among the rest, are like-minded associates and will be pillars of the future Jewish Jerusalem, quite

[1] Bleek, Lücke, Ewald, have also accepted this. The author calls himself *only* a servant, i. 1, xxii. 6; a fellow-worker, i. 9; a prophet of the Church with the spirit of the prophets, xxii. 6, ix. 10. He speaks objectively of the Apostles, indeed of the holy Apostles, the dead, condemned to death by Rome (but not precisely Peter and Paul), xviii. 20, xxi. 14.

as distinctly as, on the other hand, in its open antagonism, it shakes and contradicts the attitude of Paul.[1] Luke and Mark have, in two instances, as well as in the name "Sons of thunder," pointed out the violent Jewish zealot-spirit of John, without being impelled, on the ground of a so-called conversion which they must have survived and witnessed, to attempt any explanation, toning down, or adjustment, or to interpolate a fresh and supplementary passage, as they well understood how to do. On the contrary, since the oldest Gospel contained nothing upon the subject, they have given just those accounts which in the memory of the age were characteristic of the complete life of the Apostle; by assuming—as they evidently do—the death of the Apostle, they have not left open even the possibility of future further development.[2]

But in defiance of these authorities, the Apostle must, "in the crisis of the apostolic faith"—as Réville supposed, but was afterwards compelled to deny—have so far developed as to become the Apostle of this Gospel.[3] It has been customary, since Lücke, to suppose that the destruction of Jerusalem, and subsequent intercourse with the bereaved churches planted by Paul, and with the highly-cultivated Greek Ephesus, had, notwithstanding Rev. ii. 2, effected in John a Pauline, a super-Pauline purification from Jewish dross, and had also enriched him with Philonic studies and Gnostic speculations. Even Schenkel leaves this enlightenment theory an open question.[4] Let us no longer dispute whether such a change was possible, but simply whether it did partly really take place. That is, did John survive to the end of the first, the beginning of the second, century; was he in

[1] We must not go so far as to find—with Volkmar—Paul in the false prophet in chap. xiii., which is very arbitrary; but in the Epistles to the churches, especially in that to the Ephesian church (ii. 2), there is an unmistakable reference to the followers of Paul, and through them to their Apostle himself. Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 1, 2, and even Acts xv. 25 sq. As to the disputes in Ephesus, see as early as Rom. xvii. 17—20.

[2] Luke ix. 49 sq., 51 sqq.; Mark iii. 17, ix. 38 sqq.

[3] Comp. Godet, p. 55.

[4] P. 33.

Asia Minor, was he in Ephesus? An account belonging to the second century has certainly supplied the material out of which the whole hypothesis has been constructed; and though the account itself indulges in no psychological inferences, draws no bold conclusions, it has, by asserting the naked fact of a residence in Ephesus, undesignedly furnished an explanation of the great metamorphosis, a solution of an embarrassing difficulty.

But it is necessary to be exact. Up to the end of the second century we seek in vain for the Apostle John in Asia Minor. The New Testament, even to its latest portions—and we would particularly mention the Acts of the Apostles, which was written long after the destruction of Jerusalem—is wholly silent upon this point. Long after the middle of the second century, the same silence is found in the Epistles of Ignatius, in the three and the seven, not merely in the Epistle to Smyrna, but also in those to Polycarp and Ephesus. The same silence reigns in Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians and in the Smyrnean history of his martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius. All these works are silent as to an Apostle John in Asia Minor, and the latter works even as to an Apostle John at all,—the Apostle that afterwards became the dearest possession of the Church which, up to the year 170, cared to mention or to hear no name but that of Paul.[1] In the shorter and yet fabulous account of the martyrdom of Ignatius, written centuries later, we first find Ignatius and Polycarp, who were of Asia Minor, entitled the scholars of the Apostle John—an error which even Eusebius knew how to estimate.[2] To the silent witnesses, we next add one that speaks.

[1] *Smyrn. Ep.* ap. Eus. 4, 15. See Polycarp, *ad Philipp.* 3, 9, 11. Ignatius, *ad Eph.* 12: everywhere only Paul. This "surprising" phenomenon has been perceived by Bleek (*Beiträge*, pp. 89 sq., 257 sq.), and Grimm, Ersch and Gruber (art. *Johannes*, ii. sect., 22nd part, 1843), but has been disposed of by the *argum. ex silentio*, and the like. Bleek appeals to the genuine Ignatius of Cureton, where Eph. 12 is wanting. A poor consolation, even if the Cur. Ignatius stood upon a firm footing.

[2] Ignat. *Mart.* 1, 3. Hilgenfeld, *Apost. Väter.* pp. 212 sqq., assigns these earlier, shorter acts to the fourth century. Eusebius, in the Chronicle, but not in the Church History (3, 22, 36) calls Ignatius the scholar of the Apostle.

Bishop Papias, of Hierapolis in Phrygia, not far from Ephesus, the contemporary and friend of Polycarp of Smyrna, born about A.D. 80—90, flourishing with Polycarp after the time of Trajan, and, according to the Alexandrian Chronicle, a martyr about A.D. 161—163, a man of antiquity, a storehouse of information, an enthusiastic collector of the oldest traditions,—this man, according to his own testimony, which has been ludicrously distorted, neither knew personally nor assumed the existence of an Apostle John in Asia Minor; on the other hand, "formerly," in early life, he had come into actual contact with an Aristion and a presbyter John, both disciples of the Lord and witnesses of old things.[1] From such as had come in contact with the men of antiquity, he had gathered information as to what Andrew or Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, Matthew, or other disciples of the Lord had said; as well as what Aristion and the presbyter John, disciples of the Lord, "say." Thus he had seen none of the Apostles, he had spoken only with disciples and companions of the ancients (which latter term here means the Apostles); and in the information which he acquired concerning the Apostles, John, the assumed president of the neighbouring city of Ephesus, did not occupy the first, but almost the last, position among them, was as far removed from himself—the man of Asia Minor—as Matthew, of whose relations to Asia Minor the Church has never heard anything. Though the passage clearly asserts that the Lord's disciples, Aristion and John the ancient—the latter undeniably quite a distinct man from the Apostle, as is specially seen in the placing of his name after that of Aristion—survived to the time of Papias, yet its construction is in favour of the assumption that Papias had not derived information from them personally; Eusebius, however, who was acquainted with the work of Papias, positively asserts that the

[1] Iren. *Haer.* 5, 33, 4. Eus. 3, 36, 39. In both, ἀρχαῖος ἀνήρ, friend of Polycarp. Since, in the year 166 (Hilgenfeld, *Paschastreit*, pp. 241 sq.), the latter is eighty years old (Eus. 4, 15), the date of Papias' birth can also be approximately calculated. His death, *Chron. Pasch.* ed. Dind. 1, p. 481.

latter often appeals to them, and indeed that he calls himself a hearer of both—a fact which it is hardly possible that Eusebius could merely have inferred from the appeals just mentioned.[1] This information dispels all obscurity; it shows that there was no Apostle John in Asia Minor; but it suggests also the probability that, in a later age, when, in Asia Minor as well as in Corinth or Rome, there grew up a strong desire to possess Apostles, channels of the pure tradition in opposition to Gnosticism, the John that so evidently belonged to Asia Minor, "the ancient," or "the presbyter," whose life went back to the time of the Apostles, nay, to that of the Lord himself, and extended forward into the second century, was confounded with the Apostle John.

It was thus, in fact, that it happened. Under the combined influences of misunderstanding and of the necessities of the time, Irenæus, a native of Asia Minor, in his work against the heretics, written in the later years of the Roman bishop Eleutherus (A.D. 177—190), in his Epistle to the Roman bishop Victor (A.D. 190—200), and in his Epistle to the companion of his youth, the Gnostic Florinus, first proclaimed John the Apostle of Asia Minor.[2] From the mouth of Bishop Polycarp, of Smyrna (ob. 166), and of many other ancients who, with Polycarp, stood con-

[1] Eus. 3, 39, *οὔκ ὀκνήσω δέ σοι καὶ ὅσα ποτὲ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καλῶς ἔμαθον—συγκατατάξαι.—Εἰ δέ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἐλθοί, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβ. ἀνέκρινον λόγους. τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τι Πέτρος εἶπεν ἤ τι Φίλιππος ἤ τι Θωμᾶς ἤ Ἰάκωβος ἤ τι Ἰωάννης ἤ Ματθαῖος ἤ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν. ἅ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταὶ λέγουσι.* We cannot here enter into a detailed exegesis. But where there is a sense of truth, it has been found since the time of Eusebius that there were two Johns, both disciples of the Lord, the one an Apostle, the other not, the one dead, the other living in the time of Papias' youth. Self-deception and want of truth have converted the two into one.—The *πρεσβύτεροι* are clearly, as with Irenæus (seniores), the men of Christian antiquity, among whom the Apostles and the disciples of the Lord themselves are to be reckoned: hence also "John the ancient."

[2] *Haer.* 3, 3, 4, &c. Also the *Fragments*, ed. Stieren, I. pp. 822 sqq., preserved by Eus. 5, 20, 24. Date of Irenæus' book, Iren. 3, 3, 3. Comp. Eus. 5, 1, 22, 28. The passage, *Haer.* 3, 3, 4, shows that, since Polycarp in Smyrna (ob. A.D. 166) had already had a number of successors, the date fixed upon must be the later years of the Roman bishop Eleutherus.

nected with John, Irenæus, as a boy, about A.D. 150—160, had heard many memorable things concerning John, the Lord's disciple, who, as Paul's successor in Asia Minor, lived in Ephesus, wrote the Revelation and the Gospel, and died, at a very great age, in the reign of the Emperor Trajan.[1]

But we are able quickly to trace the origin of the delusion which Irenæus disastrously transferred from his youth to his manhood, and imposed as a sacred truth upon the so-called apologists of modern times down to Tischendorf.[2] Polycarp, according to Irenæus' own testimony, adopted by Eusebius, was the contemporary and friend of Papias.[3] Here the question at once presents itself, Could Polycarp, with many others who survived to the days of Irenæus, have been an eye- and ear-witness of the Apostle John, and of many Apostles besides, while his contemporary, neighbour, and friend in Phrygia remained without any connection with the Apostle, or with the Apostles, and, notwithstanding Polycarp and the witness close at hand, was a most laborious collector of the scattered traditions concerning the Apostles? We have here a series of impossibilities. Yet Irenæus explains himself. He generally calls the John of Polycarp only disciple of the Lord, not Apostle, just as Papias spoke so often of the presbyter John as the disciple of the Lord.[4] And he goes still further, calling Papias, as well as Polycarp, the disciple of John, who was the disciple of the Lord.[5] Of a second

[1] Comp. only *Haer.* 2, 22, 5; 5, 30, 1; 33, 3. As a boy, *ad Florin.* (παῖς ὤν), and *Haer.* 3, 3, 4. Ephesus, *ib.* 2, 22, 5; 3, 3, 4. Trajan, *ib.* Apocalypse, *ib.* 5, 30, 3. Gospel, *ib.* 3, 1, 1; 3, 11, 1.

[2] Tischendorf, *Ev.* 7, 8.

[3] Iren. 5, 33, 4: ταῦτα δὲ καὶ Παπίας, Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστὴς, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονὼς, ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ, ἐγγράφως ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ. Eus. *H. E.* 3, 36, 39; *Chron.* Olymp. 220: Joannem ap. usque ad Trajani tempora permansisse Irenæus tradit. Post quem ejusdem auditores agnoscebantur Papias Jeropolitanus et Polycarpus.

[4] Jo. discipulus domini, 2, 22, 5; 5, 33, 3. Μαθητὴς κυρίου, 3, 1, 1; 3, 4; 11, 1; 5, 26, 1. Also, the confounding of the two, *e.g. Epistle to Victor:* Πολύκ. ἅτε μετὰ Ἰωάννου τοῦ μαθητοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων, οἷς συνδιέτριψεν, ἀεὶ τετηρηκώς. *Haer.* 2, 22, 5.

[5] 5, 33, 4.

John he knows nothing. Here is the explanation. Papias is not the disciple of the Apostle, but of another John; and Polycarp, therefore, is not the disciple of the Apostle, but of the other John, the disciple of the Lord. Even Eusebius succeeded in detecting the self-delusion of Irenæus, which he himself at first carelessly adopted. In his Chronicle he has called Papias and Polycarp disciples of the Apostle; but in his Church History he has shown the error in the case of Papias, but for the correction of the error as to the discipleship of Polycarp under the Apostle, his courage failed him.[1] But Irenæus himself shows how fully we are justified in untying this knot also. To the first fundamental error are added a second and a third. Eusebius, following his sources, has referred the apocalyptic and chiliastic dreams of Papias to Aristion and the presbyter John; Irenæus, on his side, has ascribed these same views and sayings of Papias to John the Apostle. And Eusebius adds that Papias, with his pretended Johannine tradition, was responsible for the chiliastic errors of Irenæus and others.[2] It is evident that the persons and what is ascribed to them exactly correspond: the chiliastic John of Irenæus is in every point the same as the chiliastic John of Papias. Finally, the John of Papias, like the John of Polycarp, lives in Asia Minor, and survives to be an old man in the time of Trajan, until the end of the first, perhaps the beginning of the second, century (how otherwise could Papias have been his hearer?); thus the strange apparitions coincide so completely in name, title, age, time, locality, and principles, that only stupidity or obstinacy can persist in maintaining the proposition that they actually existed side by side.

[1] See the passage in the *Chron.* quoted above, p. 221; and, on the other hand, Eus. *H. E.* 3, 39: Παπίας τοὺς μέν τῶν ἀποστόλων λόγους παρὰ τῶν αὐτοῖς παρηκολουθηκότων ὁμολογεῖ παρειληφέναι· Ἀριστίωνος δὲ καὶ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ἰωάννου αὐτήκοον ἑαυτὸν φησὶ γενέσθαι. ὀνομαστὶ γ' οὖν. . . . . But while he clearly recognized the error of Irenæus as to Papias, he wrote of Polycarp without suspicion, τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁμιλητής. Eus. 3, 36. Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 18, exactly follows the opinion of Eusebius on the two Johns of Papias.

[2] Iren. *Haer.* 5, 33, 4. Eus. 3, 39.

After Irenæus, however, the belief in the Apostle of Asia Minor quickly spread, especially outside of Asia Minor. We need mention only Tertullian, Clement and Origen, Eusebius and Jerome. The Revelation of John (Easter, A.D. 69) also contributed to this belief: recognized by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and the great Fathers, as a work of the Apostle, it pointed plainly enough to Asia Minor and Ephesus; and Apollonius (cir. A.D. 170—180) was able to tell of a man in Ephesus whom John—not indeed defined as the Apostle, but as the writer of the Apocalypse—had raised from the dead.[1] Asia Minor naturally favoured the belief, and from the beginning Irenæus was not the only one in error. Thus Polycrates, the bishop of Ephesus, of an old family of Asia Minor, the successor of seven bishops, in the Easter controversy (between A.D. 190—200) tells the Roman bishop that John was among the great lights of Asia Minor, as well as Philip, one of the twelve disciples, and Philip's virgin daughters; and that this John, who had ministered and died in Ephesus, was he who had leaned on the Lord's breast, had been a priest, had worn the sacerdotal frontlet, and had died a martyr.[2] But it is not difficult for criticism to discover the great historical flaws in the rhetoric of the bishop of Ephesus, whose authoritative streams of truth an infatuated dogmatism was so eager to drink. What he gives are only fantastic pictures gleaned from the Revelation and the Gospel; in contradiction to the earliest witnesses, he has converted Philip into an Apostle, and located the grave of one of his daughters in Ephesus, while Philip and his four daughters were, according to Proclus, buried in Hierapolis.[3] Finally, he has not ventured to call John an Apostle, but has strangely ranked him below Philip the Apostle and his four daughters, and has further brought him into proximity to Poly-

[1] Apollon. ap Eus. 5, 18. The date of the anti-Montan. authors, see above, p. 209, note 3.

[2] Eus. 3, 31; 5, 24.

[3] The terminology reminds us both of the Gospel (xiii. 23) and the Revelation (i. 6, 9, vii. 3 sqq., xiv. 1, xxii. 4, &c.). Philip with the daughters, not the Apostle; see Acts viii. 1 sqq., xxi. 8 sq. Papias, Eus. 3, 39. Proclus, ib. 3, 31.

carp, Thraseas, Sagaris, Papirius, Melito, later, indeed quite late, figures in history; on this account, even Hitzig and Wieseler suspect that he has confounded him with the presbyter John.[1] What is most remarkable, and a sign of the tenacious historical character of the presbyter John, is the continued indelibility of the recollection of his ministry, notwithstanding his being confounded with the Apostle. Irenæus and Polycrates would absorb him into the Apostle. Later writers, incapable of recovering the correct unity, establish at least a duality, by which they also endeavour to solve some of the difficulties of the New Testament. Dionysius of Alexandria (in the middle of the third century) knows of different Johns, and of two Ephesian sepulchral monuments. Eusebius takes up the account afresh, follows Papias in seeking the presbyter in the second grave, and points to the presbyter as the author of the Revelation. And Jerome has repeated this assumption of Eusebius' yet more positively, without, however, concealing the fact that some, repudiating the distinct personality of the presbyter, held the two graves to be monuments of the one Apostle.[2] Even the Apostolical Constitutions mention, in close connection with the Aristion (Ariston) of Papias, a John, bishop of Ephesus, a follower of Timothy and the Apostles, especially of John, to whom belonged the honour of installing him in his office.[3]

Thus, until now, have the real person and his wraith marched side by side. Lützelberger's somewhat too stormy attempt (1840) to expel the Apostle John from proconsular Asia has not succeeded in reviving the criticism begun by Eusebius; on the contrary, one member of the critical school, Schwegler, has reprimanded the inconsiderate critic and corrected his infatuated criticism almost as warmly as Wilibald Grimm, who in this case

[1] Wieseler, *Des Papias Zeugniss über d. Presb. Johannes, theol. Mitarbeiten*, 1840, pp. 113 sqq. (comp. Jachmann, *ib.* 1839). Hitzig, *Joh. Markus*, 1843, pp. 5 sqq. Comp. also Credner, *Einl.;* Lücke, *Comm. Joh.;* Gass, article *Joh. Presb.*, in *Herzog.*

[2] Dion. ap. Eus. 7, 25. Eus. 3, 39. Jerome, *Cat.* 9.

[3] 7, 46.

is a veritable Hotspur.[1] The critical school, down to Hilgenfeld and Volkmar, has tenaciously held fast to the Apostle of Asia Minor, and has taken advantage of his connection with the Easter controversy in Asia Minor to employ him as a useful ally in the war against the fourth Gospel; while, on the other hand, it has smiled at the nebulous presbyter. Here is, indeed, no sign of the historical criticism which at the same time was brought to bear by Baur and Hilgenfeld, with so much learning and brilliancy, upon the apparent proofs of Weitzel and Steitz—recognized also by Bleek—in the question of the Easter controversy in Asia Minor.[2] On the other hand, the flaws in the argument have not been overlooked by Lücke, Grimm, Wieseler, and others; but plainly and anxiously as it is perceived that the confounding of one person with another could very often occur in early times, the "most certain tradition" of the Ephesian episcopate has been, out of love for the fourth Gospel, with rhetoric and menaces raised into incontrovertible fact. And since it is impossible, with Guerike, Hengstenberg, Lange, and more recently Zahn and Riggenbach, to extinguish afresh the unwelcome presbyter—whom Tischendorf also permits to live—together with the Apostle, the inquiry on either hand is—at present feebly—directed towards the harmless and very variously answered question, whether the presbyter succeeded the Apostle, or the Apostle the presbyter, in the city which is the stronghold of the critics in question—Ephesus. In the foregoing discussion we have disposed of the spectral duplicate John, and it remains

[1] Lützelberger, *Die kirchliche Tradition über den Apostel Johannes und seine Schriften in ihrer Grundlosigkeit nachgewiesen*, 1840. Schwegler's notice of it, *Theol. Jahrbb.* 1842, pp. 293 sqq. Grimm, l. c.

[2] See Hilgenfeld, *Ev.* p. 339; *Kanon*, p. 229; *Zeitschrift*, 1861, p. 312. Ewald's notice in *Lit. Centralblatt*, 1862. Volkmar, *Comm. Apok.* pp. 39 sqq. The conclusive work of Hilgenfeld's on the Easter question, *Der Paschastreit*, 1860. Also his essay on the Quartodecimanism of Asia Minor and the canonical Gospels, in his *Zeitschrift*, 1861, pp. 285 sqq. Even Bleek (*Einl.* pp. 190 sqq.) could not assent to the refinements of Weitzel and Steitz, by which the John of Asia Minor, with his Judaistic Easter festival, acquires as much importance as the anti-Judaistic Evangelists.

to be seen whether any one will venture to resuscitate him, and afresh to abuse the text of Papias.[1]

Thus, after an examination of all our historical evidence, the settling of John the Apostle in Asia Minor vanishes, and this vanishing is so complete as to decide the question not only with reference to the Gospel, but also with reference to the Revelation, to the—after all only assumed—Apostle of the Ephesian Revelation; and thus the very last support of the opinion that the Gospel was written by the son of Zebedee is taken away. For the Apostle's great change, for his Paulinism, for his Philonism, for his contact with Gnosticism and particularly in its Cerinthian form as it existed in Asia Minor, and finally for the infinite duration of his life, there is no evidence, and no longer even any sufficient explanation. It can only be said that the world is large, without Ephesus, and that the change (to use Luthardt's logic) was possible, and therefore actual.

If the Gospel was not written by the Apostle John, it is very natural to fall back upon the proposition that it was composed by men who were intimate with him, by representatives of his school and tradition, whether called by the ancient name of presbyter, or the modern name of secretary. This would at once explain the merits and the defects of the Gospel. Hence Ewald and Weizsäcker have recently revived this hypothesis; and Renan and even Schenkel speak of a Johannine Ephesian school, and Nicolas brings his John the presbyter, and Tobler his Apollos, as author of the Gospel, into connection with the Apostle John.[2] But these are mere expedients, and the secretaries have never prospered in the New Testament. It is at once clear that the men who adopted the Johannine tradition could, as little as

[1] Against Zahn, comp. also Overbeck on two new views of the evidences of Papias, *Hilg. Zeitschrift*, 1867, pp. 35 sqq.

[2] Comp. Tobler, *Die Ev.-Frage*, 1858. Mich. Nicolas, *Revue German.* 1863, April, June. Comp. Godet, *Comm. zu Joh.*, *Auszug v. Wirz*, 1866, p. 32.

John himself, so radically transform the actual history and John's actual principles; the problem, therefore, comes back to us again, but in a reduced form. Does not the solution lie close at hand? Since the Apostle is not the author, why not the now tangible John the presbyter, himself also in some sense a disciple of the Lord? How many things harmonize with this hypothesis —his place of abode, his time, perhaps even his conflict with Cerinthus; and does not the New Testament itself point to him, in the second and third Epistles of John, with the title of presbyter, and in the appendix to the Gospel, with the testimony to his great age? Thus, indeed, Nicolas has recognized the presbyter, who, under the leadership of Dionysius, and later of Grotius, has been made use of to satisfy the necessities of the New Testament—the disciple, says Nicolas, of John the Apostle—as the author of the Gospel. Unfortunately, a number of circumstances, and especially the trustworthy tradition of Papias and Irenæus as to the grossly material Chiliasm of the presbyter, disturb this hypothesis; the presbyter would have been far more likely than even the Synoptics to have written the direct opposite of the spiritual Gospel. *He*, also, with the inhabitants of Asia Minor, would have dated the paschal festival from the 14th of Nisan, in opposition to the Gospel, as Baur and Hilgenfeld have triumphantly shown. Other names can be found: Tobler, in 1858, suggested Apollos, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and an acquaintance of the Apostle of Ephesus; yet the supposed author of the Epistle to the Hebrews does not altogether accord with the style and spirit of the Gospel, and, moreover, Apollos was much earlier, was no eye-witness, and, as he was living in Ephesus in A.D. 50—60, could scarcely have been acquainted with the eye-witness. Perhaps Gaius will also be again suggested, who appears in the third Epistle, and whom an old author held to be the editor of the Gospel in Ephesus, only he unfortunately converted a Corinthian into an Ephesian![1]

The results of our inquiry amount simply to this: the Gospel

[1] 3 John i. Comp. *Synops. Script. S.* in De Wette's *Einl.* p. 238.

was published in the beginning of the second century under the name of the Apostle John, by one who was well acquainted with the Holy Land, a Jewish Christian, but liberal and friendly towards the Gentiles, probably one of the Jewish Dispersion in Asia Minor.[1] A fictitious adoption of the presbyter's name is as little credible as the supposition of his actual authorship; the "Apostle," the "beloved disciple," by the side of Peter, remains the mysterious figure of the Gospel, and there is also wanting every sign, every probability, that the Apostle and the presbyter —the latter only just departed from the scene—should, in the second decade of the second century, be so completely confounded one with the other as they were at the end of the century by Irenæus, Polycrates, and indeed also by the author of the second and third Epistle and of the Appendix. What induced the author to attach to his Gospel the name of the Apostle John, may still, at least with some probability, be detected. The Apostle was zealous against false doctrine, and more particularly was he one of those beloved disciples of Jesus to whom the Church very early ascribed a closer acquaintance with the Master; and the author was anxious to bring him into the field at this terrible crisis against Gnosticism and on behalf of the united Church, that was laboriously building itself up out of Jews and Gentiles.[2] He could not make Paul his representative, for Paul was no original witness, and was a man of controversy, and thus

[1] Schenkel, as well as Baur, holds him to have been neither a Palestinian nor a Jew, p. 353. A Jew by birth, but residing out of Palestine, is suggested, not only by such passages as vii. 35, xii. 20, but still more by the Hellenistic culture and freedom from—especially Christian—tradition. The condition of the Palestinian Christians under Trajan is sufficiently represented in the person of Bishop Simeon, Eus. 3, 21, 32. Comp. cap. 35, 4, 5, 6. Asia Minor is suggested by Irenæus, Cerinthus, the Apocalypse, and also by the prominence given to the person of Philip; comp. i. 44 sqq., vi. 7, xii. 20 sqq., xiv. 8 sqq.; though the confounding of the Apostle with the deacon—which is not done by Luke—must be assumed. In other respects, we might think of Egypt, where the Epistles to the Hebrews and of Barnabas, works so closely allied to this, probably had their origin.

[2] Comp. Matt. xvii. 1; Mark iii. 17; Luke ix. 49, 54. Clem. ap. Eus. 2, 1: Ἰακώβῳ τῷ δικαίῳ (brother of Jesus) καὶ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ Πέτρῳ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν παρέδωκε τὴν γνῶσιν ὁ κύριος.

did not harmonize with the author's sense of unity. Of the other beloved disciples of Jesus, James had passed away too early, on the very threshold of the apostolic age; and Peter's name had long since been appropriated by other writings, and most pointedly in association with a strictly Jewish schism.[1] John alone remained.[2] It is also possible that by that time the belief had already grown up that the Apostle John was the author of the Ephesian Revelation, a book which in point of fact came from a prophet John of that church, perhaps from the identical Chiliastic presbyter. For this confusion between the Apostle John and the author of the Apocalypse took place certainly before that between the two personalities, the Apostle and the presbyter: indeed, some time before Irenæus, Justin Martyr, in the Dialogue with Trypho (cir. 160—166), is a witness—the earliest—to the former confusion.[3] This confusion can throw fresh light upon the question. The name of the Apostle John would the rather be the rallying-point in Asia Minor if he had at any time there delivered his testimony, proclaimed the Lord, the Word of God, opposed false doctrine, pointed out the Antichrist. It was necessary now, in order to meet the exigencies of the times, only to make him deliver his testimony in a fresh manner, to exhibit him as rejecting the hydra of Gnosticism as Anti-christianity, and as making known the mystery of darkness, on the one hand, and the mystery of the glory of Jesus, on the other. If, finally, there remains an unexplained enigma in the remarkable coincidence that a Gospel under the name of the Apostle John should have been written in the district, in the city, at the time, and in some degree even in the spirit of the presbyter John, who had just then, or immediately before, been labouring as a person of recognized importance; and if, on this account, the ascription of the

[1] Baur and Schwegler ascribe to the Gospel even an anti-Petrine tendency. Comp. also Hilgenfeld, p. 335, and Volkmar, *Rel. Jesu.* pp. 443, 444.

[2] Comp. Baur, *Theol. Jahrbb.* 1844, pp. 690 sqq.

[3] Justin, *Tryph.*: *ἀνήρ τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἷς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν ἀποκαλύψει.*

authorship to the presbyter still seems to be a probable approach to the truth, yet, in the first place, this play of accident, which is certainly possible, ought not to invalidate established facts; and in the next place, it may be questioned whether the ministry of the Ephesian John against Cerinthus and Gnosticism is in any way certain, and is not rather a reflection of the Revelation and the Gospel. And, finally, it may be assumed that in fact even the historical presbyter, who at any rate sympathized with the Apostle and the Apocalyptist, necessarily contributed to the renown of the name of John, of the designedly chosen, coveted, apostolic name of John, which was superior to his—the presbyter's—and was destined to shine forth into the world from Asia Minor with renewed youth.[1]

The severe reproaches which have up to the present time been hurled against the critical school, on account of its defence of "the fabrication of a forger," can be patiently borne, since these reproaches are the fruit either of ignorance or of a coarse moral nature. The Old and the New Testaments contain much-read sacred writings—e.g. the second Isaiah, Daniel, the Psalms, the Proverbs—whose authors assumed the names of great men, in order, by the help of such names, to advocate principles of which they had no reason to be ashamed. It was out of love to the holy persons of whom he wrote that the presbyter in Asia Minor, the author of the narrative of Paul and Thecla, wrote as he did; and it was out of love for the holy cause that the Old Testament writers acted as they did.[2] If it be said that the Church of that age deposed the falsifying presbyter, it can be at once answered that this was done because Thecla's acts, her teaching and her

[1] As to the partiality to the names John, Peter, Paul, see Dion. ap. Eus. 7, 25. How carelessly name and author were interchanged is shown by Dion, l. c. (as well as by Caj. *Con. Procl. Mont.* ap. Eus. 3, 28, who simply illustrates Dion.), for, according to him, even Cerinthus, who was fond of the Apocalypse, was supposed to be its author, though said to be an opponent of John's.

[2] Tertull. *Bapt.* 17: Sciant in Asia presbyterum, qui eam scripturam construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, convictum atque confessum, *id se amore Pauli fecisse*, loco decessisse.

baptizing, seemed to be opposed to the Pauline principle that the woman was to keep silence in the church, and seemed yet more to encroach upon episcopal rights. Another example of the same kind is found in the fact, that the rigidly ecclesiastical Roman author of the so-called Muratorian Fragment, in strong contrast with the severe judges of the present day, quietly permitted the Epistle of Jude and the second and third Epistles of John, which he held to be spurious, to be used by the "Catholic Church," because they were written "in honour of the Apostles."[1] At that period, no names but those of the Apostles had any weight, and it was to the authority of the Apostles that the whole body of the Church appealed. Köstlin may be consulted upon this point.[2] Thus the fourth Gospel would not be considered a fabrication, though it bore fictitiously the name of the Apostle. Its beauty, its edifying character, its sanctity, even the elevating, sweet, winning impression of such passages as John iii. 16, iv. 23, xiv. 2,—passages that are so worthy of the lips of Jesus, and which every one would have been delighted to hear from *his* mouth,—these things do not ultimately depend *merely* on the name, as those suppose who strip the holy of its sanctity when the name is thus or thus wanting. The God of the spirits of all men and the Lord of the Church has, out of his abundant fulness, spoken not merely through John, not even merely through the lips of the Son of Man, but through all who have loved him in Jesus. Our author wrote also in the righteous conviction that the Apostles, that John would have written thus had he been living at that time; the author wrote in the prosecution of his mission, and in dependence upon the Spirit of Truth to which the future belonged, the Spirit on which he believed, and which he so zealously proclaimed. It must not be overlooked, that he does not once roundly assert that John was the author, but simply

[1] Epistola sane Judæ et superscriptione Johannis duæ in catholica (ecclesia) habentur, ut sapientia ab amicis Salomonis *in honorem ispius scripta.*

[2] Köstlin, *Die pseudonyme Literatur*, &c., *Theol. Jahrbb.* 1851, pp. 149 sqq. Comp. Schenkel, p. 32. Strauss, l. c. p. 113.

aims at disposing the reader to accept the contents of the book as coming from the Apostle; and, moreover, that he never attempts to establish the merely external incidents, with which he takes so many liberties, but seeks only to give prominence to the Spirit that dominates every part of the life of Jesus. A youth in his love, and not much more than a youth in his years, without doubt the most illustrious of those who flourished in the post-apostolic age, he writes in the fulness of fresh and holy inspiration: let no one, in the spirit of petty strife, do dishonour either to his gifts, or to science, which, while it resolutely bases the history of Jesus upon the surest sources, at the same time commends the author of the fourth Gospel to the honourable recognition of religion.[1]

[1] It is a fixed assumption that the second century was incapable of such an achievement. Yet there is one pearl in this literature, the Epistle to Diognetus; as well as much that is fine in the Apostolical Fathers, and in the Apologists from Justin to Theophilus; and, even on Roman soil, there are Minucius Felix, with the splendid scenery of his beautiful dialogue, and the clever and vigorous composition in the Clem. Hom. It would be easy to show (with Tzschirner and others against Mangold) that Min. Felix, as well as the Epistle to Diognetus, must be assigned to the last years of Marcus Aurelius.

First Part.

THE SACRED GROUND-WORK.

First Division.—THE POLITICAL GROUND-WORK.

Superficially considered, the nation of Israel was not in its worst condition at the time of the birth of Jesus. In the extent of its territory, which included the commanding chain of hills from the eastern deserts to the blue waters of the Mediterranean, in the number and vigour of its inhabitants, in religious splendour, even in the artistic adornments of Jerusalem, and in the magnificence of its court, it might vie with that Davidic period to which the nation had, for a thousand years, looked back as to its golden age.[1] Behind this new prosperity there lay, indeed, not only the history of centuries of suffering—of Asiatic exile, and alternating Chaldean, Persian, and Syro-Grecian servitude—but also the shattered dream of the restored Davidic era that for fifty years seemed to have risen upon the people of Israel, "the Servant of God," in the middle of the second pre-Christian century, under men who were heroes, princes, priests, and prophets,

[1] Comp., generally, Ewald, *Gesch. des Volks Israel*, IV. (3rd ed. 1864), V. (*Gesch. Christus*, 1855, 2nd ed. 1857), VI. 1858. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volks Israel von Zerstörung des erst. Tempels bis zum Makk. Schimeon*, 3 vols. 1847—1857. Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, Part I. 1857. Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, III. 1863. Schneckenburger, *Vorl. über N. T. Zeitgeschichte*, 1862. Oehler, article *Volk Gottes*, in *Herzog's Encycl.* XVII. Also the articles *Hasmonäer*, *Makkabäer*, *Herodes*, *Römer*, in *Winer* and *Herzog*. Concerning the national vigour, see Phil. *Leg. ad Caj.*, Frankfort edition, p. 1023: τοὺς τὴν Ιουδαίαν κατοικοῦντας ἀπείρους τε εἶναι τὸ πλῆθος καὶ τὰ σώματα γενναιοτάτους καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς εὐτολμοτάτους. *Q. o. p. l.* p. 876, πολυανθρωπότατον γένος τῶν Ιουδαίων.

under Judas Maccabæus (B.C. 167—161), the deliverer from the arrogance of the successors of Alexander, and under Jonathan and Simon, brothers of Judas, and John Hyrcanus (ob. B.C. 107), Simon's son. A second half-century, with its inevitable conflict between Greek and Hebrew culture, although embellished with the name of royalty (Aristobulus I., ob. B.C. 106), again wasted the prosperity and power of the Maccabæan or Asmonæan house, until Herod the Great—the fortunate adventurer who sprang from the Edomites, those southern descendants of Esau whom John Hyrcanus had subdued and compelled to submit to circumcision—by energy, subtlety, and murder, made himself its heir, and built upon its ruins the new edifice of external splendour, under the protection and shadow of which Jesus was born.[1]

His father, Antipater, was the son of a governor or *Strategos* of Edom who bore the same name, and who had received his appointment from the Jewish king Alexander Jannæus (after B.C. 106), and to whom, though an Idumæan, Herod ascribed the honour of being a descendant of the genuine Babylonian Jews; while unfriendly Jewish and Jewish-Christian accounts degraded him to the son of a priest named Herod, in the heathen temple of Apollo at Ascalon, who had been kidnapped by Idumæan robbers. This Antipater, a man of importance not only on account of his possessions and "piety," but also of his energy and intrigue, had, by the aid of the Romans, the fatal early friends of the Maccabæan house, risen from the position of a friend of Hyrcanus II. (after B.C. 70), the feeble son of Salome or Alexandra, Alexander's widow, to that of procurator over the whole of Judæa. This dignity, together with the rights of a Roman citizen, was bestowed by Julius Cæsar, in the year B.C. 47 (A.U.C. 707), upon the serviceable Idumæan, because the latter, in B.C. 63 (A.U.C. 691), in the consulship of Cicero, had betrayed the Holy Land to the Romans by stirring up enmity

[1] Herod the Great, *Ant.* 18, 5, 4; comp. Ewald, IV. 3rd ed. p. 546. As to Herod's estimate of himself, see below; but comp., at the outset, Tert. *Præscr.* 45: Herodiani, qui *Christum Herodem* esse dixerunt.

between Hyrcanus and his abler brother Aristobulus II., had led the legions of Pompey (B.C. 63), and afterwards those of Gabinius and Crassus (cir. B.C. 60—54), to the conquered soil of Jerusalem and the temple, and had robbed the country of its freedom, its honour, its boundaries, and even of the name of king.[1] From the year B.C. 47, Hyrcanus, appointed high-priest and prince of the people (Ethnarch) by the Romans, sank more and more into insignificance: Antipater ruled, without ever using violence towards Hyrcanus; he rebuilt the walls of Jerusalem, and from among his four heroic sons (by Kypros, an Arabian woman), he made the eldest, Phasael, governor of the district of the holy city, and a younger one, Herod, governor of Galilee.[2] This young man, then scarcely twenty-five years old, soon surpassed even his father. He won his first renown in the land in which another was to follow him with a different kind of greatness,—he delivered Galilee from the robber-bands whose most dreaded

[1] Antipas, the head of the house, Jos. *Ant.* 14, 1, 3. Antipater, the father of Herod the Great, an Idumæan, *ib.* The Jewish (Lightf. p. 259) and Jewish-Christian tradition (indeed from the mouth of the immediate successors of Jesus), Justin, *Tryph.* 52. Jul. Afric. ap. Eus. 1, 7. Eus. *Chron.* Ewald, IV. p. 518, believes that Ascalon was the native place of the family. Comp. the favour shown to Ascalon by Herod, *B. J.* 1, 21, 11. Also comp. 2, 6, 3; *Ant.* 14, 1, 3. According to another passage, it was only the mother of Herod who was Idumæan or Arabian (*Ant.* 14, 7, 3); but this appears to belong to the falsification of the history by the historiographer Nicolaus of Damascus (14, 1, 3), who derived the family from the most genuine Jews of the Babylonish exile. Herod is said to have burnt the genealogies in order to conceal his origin, Jul. Afric. ap. Eus. 1, 7. The Edomites were Judaized by Hyrcanus, *Ant.* 15, 7, 9. Governor, στρατηγὸς, 14, 1, 3; ἄρχων, 15, 7, 9. The conquest by Pompey, 14, 4. Tac. *Hist.* 5, 9: Templum jure victoriæ ingressus est. Muri diruti, delubrum mansit. Cic. *Pro Flacc.* 28: Quam cara (gens) Diis immort. esset, docuit, quod est *victa*, quod *elocata*. Gabinus, Crassus, *Ant.* 14, 5, 1—7, 1. Gerlach, *Röm. Statthalter*, 1865, pp. 5 sqq. The procuratorship through Cæsar, *Ant.* 14, 8, 5. The year B.C. 47, also Gerlach, p. 7. Comp. also Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden.* III. pp. 134 sqq. Aul. Gabinius, consul B.C. 58, in Syria B.C. 57—55, a Pompeian, a general, as brave and prudent as dissolute and money-making; comp. Baumstark, *Gens Gabinia*, Pauly.—Not only was the grandfather of Herod the Great called Antipas, but his father also at first, until he assumed the fuller-sounding Antipater, *Ant.* 14, 1, 3. Ascalon: also Sulpic. Severus, *Chron.* ii. 27: Antipatri *Ascalonitæ* filius. Also the wise, pragmatic remark: Etenim jam adventante Christo necesse erat secundum vaticinia prophetarum *suis eos ducibus privari*, ne quid ultra Christum exspectarent.

[2] *Ant.* 14, 9, 1, 2. Kypros, *Ant.* 14, 7, 3; 15, 6, 5; comp. Grätz, III. p. 151.

leader was Hezekiah; but in so doing he made himself the special object of the hatred of the national and hierarchical party against the Edomites, the friends of Rome, the new tyrants, since he dealt summarily with the robbers, without appealing to the legal authorities. When summoned by Hyrcanus before the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem, he appeared with a military escort, wearing purple, with his head anointed, and bearing a letter of safe conduct from his patron, Sextus Cæsar, the governor of Syria. In the exasperated tribunal, only Shemaiah (Sameas), a teacher of the law, was bold enough to raise a voice against him, and Hyrcanus allowed the insolent young man to withdraw: the latter hastened to Syria, purchased the governorship of Cœle-Syria and Samaria (B.C. 46), marched with an army at once upon Jerusalem, and, with difficulty induced by his father and brother to return, gloried in having at least made the country aware of his anger.[1]

Neither the death of Julius Cæsar in March, B.C. 44, nor the civil war at Rome, nor the poisoning of his father Antipater at the table of Hyrcanus in B.C. 43, interfered with Herod's progress. He purchased the favour of Cæsar's murderers by the unexampled haste with which he brought in his large contributions—a hundred talents (more than £20,000) for Galilee alone; and he gained from Cassius the procuratorship of Syria, with the promise—in the event of a victory over Antonius and Octavianus—of the regal dignity: a prospect which cost his father his life. Nor was Herod's cause lost after the unsuccessful engagement at Philippi, in the autumn of B.C. 42. He succeeded in gaining the favour of Antonius by the influence of

[1] *Ant.* 14, 9, 1—5; *B. J.* 1, 10, 4—9. Sext. Cæsar died A.U.C. 708=B.C. 46, Gerlach, p. 8. In *Ant.* 14, 9, 2, Herod is said to have been fifteen years old on his first appearance in history; but this does not harmonize with the age to which he attained (about 70 years, *Ant.* 17, 6, 1). For, according to the chronology of *Ant.* 14, 9, 2 (47+15=B.C. 62, the birth of Herod), he would have lived to be only 58. The number 70 can be best obtained by substituting 25 for 15; for although Josephus repeatedly says that Herod was quite young in B.C. 47, this can be explained by other examples, given by Grätz, p. 151. Sanhedrim, comp. Jost, 1857, pp. 270 sqq.

his person and his wealth; and in spite of all the embassies of the Jews, Phasael and Herod were appointed, B.C. 41, tetrarchs of the whole of Judæa. At the same time, Herod's espousal of Mariamne, the grand-daughter of Hyrcanus, added to all his good fortune the lustre of national and hereditary right. There came, however, an interval of difficulty. Immediately after the events above mentioned, Parthian armies overran Western Asia, while Antonius was detained by Cleopatra's charms in Egypt; they took Jerusalem, and, to the satisfaction of that city as well as of the Babylonian Jews, installed Aristobulus' son Antigonus as king, and made Phasael and Hyrcanus prisoners, while Herod escaped with difficulty. All was ended with a blow,—Herod was put to flight, Phasael killed himself, and Antigonus cut off the ears of Hyrcanus the high-priest.[1]

Herod landed in Italy as an adventurer. He met with Antonius, however, and by his means also gained over Octavianus. Fear and hatred of the Parthians effected almost more than old acquaintanceship and fresh promises; and eight days afterwards, a decree of the Senate (B.C. 40), bestowed upon Herod, beyond his most daring hopes, the kingdom of Judæa, which at first he had sought to obtain for his wife's brother. Herod attended the sacrifice and the solemn declaration of the decree of the Senate on the Capitol, taking his place between the triumvirs and escorted by the consuls.[2] As he marched through Galilee, where his bravery won to his side those who were brave, Herod slowly, and not without the aid of Roman legions, obtained possession of the land; and in his third campaign, in June (Sivan), B.C. 37, he occupied Jerusalem and the temple, in whose halls fire raged, and in whose courts blood streamed, against his will. Thus, after an interval of exactly twenty-six years to the very

[1] *Ant.* 14, 12, 13. Antonius had been previously a general under Gabinius, *Ant.* 14, 5; 2, 3.

[2] *Ant.* 14, 14. Cn. Dom. Calvino, C. Asinio Pollione Coss. (=A.U.C. 714=B.C. 40). Gerlach, *Rom. Statthalter*, erroneously gives A.U.C. 716=B.C. 38. Ewald, IV. p. 645, gives B.C. 39. Regnum ab Antonio Herodi datum victor Augustus auxit, Tac. *Hist.* 5, 9.

day, Jerusalem was a second time occupied by the Romans. At the desire of the king, Antigonus fell beneath the axe of Antonius, and the house of the Maccabæans ceased to rule.[1]

The new kingdom underwent its final crisis in the war between Antonius and Octavianus, in which Herod necessarily sided with Antonius, the friend and ruler of the East; but the intrigues of his rival claimant for the possession of Judæa, Cleopatra, kept him occupied in Arabia. The frankness with which, after the battle of Actium (September, B.C. 31), he confessed to Octavianus on the island of Rhodes his friendship for Antonius, in order to set before him the prospect of a like faithfulness, procured for him afresh the crown which Octavianus set upon his head. After Herod's first proofs of fidelity in the Egyptian campaign, and after the death of Cleopatra, which was in itself a relief to Octavianus (B.C. 30), the latter restored to Herod all the acquisitions that his intriguing enemy Cleopatra had gained at his expense in the south of the country and on the west coast, giving to him Gadara, Hippo, Samaria, on the coast Gaza, Anthedon, Joppa, the tower of Strato, in short the whole land, and even more than had been lost by Pompey's conquest. A few years later, the same patron enlarged the kingdom on the north-east, by making over to Herod, between the years B.C. 24—21, the wide extent of territory reaching to Anti-Lebanon and Damascus, in order to protect that city from attacks on the side of the desert. Herod was even appointed procurator-general of Syria, and afterwards nearly obtained the governorship of Arabia. In fact, Herod had again gathered together nearly the whole of the Davidic empire.[2]

Herod enjoyed the favour of Augustus, with occasional inter-

[1] *Ant.* 14, 15, 16. M. Vipsanio Agrippa, Luc. Caninio Gallo Coss. Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 16, 4, speaks of twenty-seven years after Pompey's taking of the city, but establishes the identity of the day.

[2] Octavian's favour, *B. J.* 1, 20; *Ant.* 15, 5, 6. The acquisitions, *B. J.* 1, 20, 3, 4; *Ant.* 15, 7, 3; 10, 1 sqq. The north-east districts (Trachonitis in B.C. 24; province of Zenodorus in B.C. 21), 15, 10, 1 sqq.; *B. J.* 1, 20, 4. Greater detail in Gerlach, pp. 13 sq. Arabia, *Ant.* 16, 10, 9.

ruptions, to the last. Once, however, the latter wrote to him that up to that time he had been his friend, henceforth he would treat him as his subject. Augustus endured even the family scandals of the new kingdom with great patience. Josephus has attempted to convey to the reader's mind an idea of the fortunate eminence to which Herod had raised himself, by mentioning, in connection with the visits of illustrious Romans between B.C. 20—15, the almost too flattering fact that of the two men who ruled the great Roman empire, Augustus and his subordinate M. Vipsanius Agrippa, Augustus esteemed Herod next to Agrippa, and Agrippa esteemed him next to Augustus.[1] A material proof of this high estimation of Herod is found in his appointment as guardian of Syria (B.C. 21) in the room of Agrippa, who was sent by Augustus into the west while the latter was in the East.[2] Herod owed his success not merely to that respectful attention which exhibited itself in costly hospitalities, gifts, and dedication of buildings of all kinds to the great men of Rome, but also to his real fidelity, his manly heroism, his pre-eminent sagacity, and his readiness to accept the culture of the West—qualities which fitted him to be a most useful ally among the susceptible populations that fringed the Roman East.

In a certain way, Herod emulated his friend in Rome, in creating an Augustan era in his own land. Like Augustus, he also brought the wars of the time to an end, and the sovereignty which was secured by the blood of the citizens, bestowed upon the land a long, almost forty-years' peace. With this peace he gave the citizens, as he himself boasted, security and prosperity; he destroyed the robber-bands in the south and the north; restored many overthrown cities, built new ones, and brought thousands of colonists, soldiers, peasants, and immigrants, into his new creations; gave to the people good ordinances and privileges, under the blessing of which even the rugged north-eastern district of the land became populous; in particular, he established a mag-

[1] The letter, *Ant.* 16, 9, 3. The friendships, 15, 10, 3; *B. J.* 1, 20.

[2] Comp. Gerlach, l.c. p. 16.

nificent centre for maritime trade, by transforming, at enormous cost, and by the labour of twelve years (B.C. 23—10), the tower of Strato, on the Mediterranean, with its haven that exceeded the Athenian Piræus in size, into the rich, splendid, and essentially Hellenized sea-port of Cæsarea, the "City of the Cæsar," with the haven "Augustus." In fact, in these quiet times, the prosperity of the land increased so much that Herod, when he began the building of the temple, could boast before the people of the unprecedented increase of the wealth and revenue of the kingdom, and could distinguish his rule by the most fabulous and luxurious expenditure.[1]

Owing his greatness to Rome—"to the all-powerful Romans," as he himself said—and by his father, who was a Roman citizen, already brought into friendly relations with the foreigner, he made it the proud aim of his life to bridge over the gulf and to remove the prejudices which for thousands of years had divided the East, and especially Palestine, from the West.[2] He wished to realize, in this most intractable part of the Roman world, the idea of a universal empire, in the sense of Augustus. Rome did not demand the blotting out of national peculiarities, as the Syro-Grecian against whom the Maccabæans revolted formerly had done; but Augustus and Agrippa, while they faithfully respected the tradition of the capital of the world, required the provinces to accommodate themselves to Rome so far as to give up at least the most salient features of what was peculiar to them. When Herod represented to the people that his innovations were not voluntary, but were in accordance with imperial commands, his representation was so far correct, that emanci-

[1] The colonists, *B. J.* 1, 21, 2; *Ant.* 16, 9, 2. Trachonitis, 17, 2, 2. Regulations for cities, *B. J.* 1, 21, 2. Cæsarea (largest city), 1, 21, 5 sqq.; *Ant.* 15, 9, 6; 16, 5, 1; 20, 8, 7. Haven, *B. J.* 1, 31, 3; *Ant.* 17, 5, 1. The date of the late consecration, his 28th year = B.C. 10—9, *Ant.* 16, 5, 1. Building ten years, *ib.*; twelve years, 15, 9, 6. The plan already about B.C. 24, *Ant.* 15, 10, 1. Grätz, B.C. 23—12; Ewald, consecration, B.C. 9. Comp. Suet. *Octav.* 60. Speech to the people, *Ant.* 15, 11, 1. Boasting of his government, *ib.*

[2] The all-powerful Romans, *ib.*

pation from exclusive Judaism was gratifying to the Romans; and as it was most conducive to his interests to obtain the approval of Rome, he sought that approval above all else.[1] At least, an enthusiastic appreciation of the ideal blessings of Israel was wanting to the Edomite, this wildling, quite as much as any profound comprehension of the western culture, the forms of which he adopted; and if his fondness for what was foreign deepened into a passion, the explanation is to be found, not only in interested motives, but chiefly in a certain vanity, in a genuine barbaric intoxication with foreign superiority, and finally, not least, in his resentment of the provocation offered by the opposition of his own people.[2]

It is true he did not altogether fail to respect the peculiarities of his nation. In B.C. 37, he marched unwillingly upon the holy city; he threw the blame of burning the courts of the temple upon Antigonus; he allowed the beasts required for sacrifice to be taken into the city during the siege; he tried to restrain murder and pillage; and by force of arms opposed the intrusion of the Romans into the holy places.[3] He himself did not enter the sanctuary, not even during the time of its rebuilding by priestly hands.[4] The edifices which were obnoxious to the people, he erected as far away as possible from Judæa and Jerusalem.[5] He endeavoured to obliterate the unfavourable impression produced by such edifices by honouring the national God in every way, by protecting the strict sect of the Pharisees, and above all—"as a proof of his perfect piety towards God"—he began in the eighteenth year of his reign (cir. B.C. 20), and after eight years' work (to B.C. 12) completed, the task of raising

[1] *Ant.* 15, 9, 5.

[2] Vanity, *Ant.* 16, 5, 4. Herod had enjoyed a certain degree of higher culture in Jerusalem, 15, 10, 5. His irascibility, 15, 9, 5; 16, 5, 4; 19, 7, 3.

[3] *Ant.* 14, 15, 2; 14, 16, 2, 3.

[4] *Ib.* 15, 11, 5. § 2: 10,000 workmen and 1000 priests in priestly garments. Comp. Ewald, IV. p. 565.

[5] *Ant.* 15, 9, 5. The buildings in Jerusalem, see below, the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem; Cæsarea, in the history of the Apostles.

the temple at Jerusalem from the mean condition in which it had been left by Zerubbabel, to that masterpiece of gold and marble which was the admiration of others besides the Galilean followers of Jesus. And indeed, when after a year and a half (B.C. 18) the main building stood forth in all its glory, the priests ministered in costly vestments, and the king himself offered three hundred oxen, he succeeded in exciting the whole nation to enthusiastic joy and gratitude to God. Here Herod—like Augustus, in the extravagant adulation of a Horace—was in his way the restorer of religion; and no one was more gratified than he with the praise which not only Israel, but Augustus and Marcus Agrippa, lavished upon his works. Augustus was, as it seems, during his Syrian journey about the year B.C. 20, also in Herod's dominion, and an admirer of the Jewish temple rites; though, consistently with his own peculiar principles, he does not appear to have entered either the temple or Jerusalem, but only Cæsarea. In the autumn of B.C. 15, Agrippa, the friend of the emperor and of the king, yielded still more complaisantly to the urgent requests of Herod, who wished to show him his land, his castles, and his great buildings in Cæsarea, Samaria, and Jerusalem, in which latter place a wing of the palace was called after him. Agrippa was present at the feast of Tabernacles, was conducted into Jerusalem with pomp and amid shouts of joy, offered a hundred oxen, gave the people a splendid banquet, yet without offending against their customs, and daily contemplated the splendour of the temple, the sacrifices, the priests, and the devotions of the multitudes, making all these novelties the chief subject of his conversation. Such an extremely good understanding appears to have existed between Jewish piety and Rome, that a numerous crowd of people, scattering branches and flowers, accompanied the Roman who had done homage to their religion to his ship at Cæsarea; and when, in B.C. 14, Herod returned the Roman's visit—which he had already repaid in gifts—by travelling back with Agrippa as far as Sinope, on the Black Sea, he was fortunate enough to be able afterwards to announce

in a public address at Jerusalem, that Agrippa—as on only one other occasion Cæsar had done for Antipater—had at his request granted to the Jews of Asia the fullest religious liberty. To this announcement he added a panegyric of his own "useful" government; and since, in a good humour, he remitted a fourth part of the tribute for the previous year, the multitude dispersed with shouts of gratitude.[1]

By the side of his respect for the Jewish religion stood, however, the favour which he exhibited towards heathenism. That favour was exhibited chiefly in monuments. From south to north arose not only cities, forts, and towers—as a defence against the foreigner and a restraint to his own people—castles and aqueducts, but also heathen temples. Thus in Cæsarea, which was called New Rome, there looked down upon the seafarers, from a commanding eminence, a splendid sanctuary of the emperor, within which were colossal figures of Augustus and Rome, in imitation of the images of Zeus and Hera at Olympia and Argos.[2] Similar magnificent temples to Augustus arose (cir. B.C. 25) in Samaria (Sebaste-Augusta), and in the north by the sources of the Jordan near Paneas, as a thanksgiving, on the newly-granted territory, immediately after the emperor's visit (B.C. 20).[3] Moreover, in the great cities, theatres and amphitheatres were built, and festivities of every kind instituted.[4] These undertakings were by no means confined to his own land, but extended to Phœnicia, Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece. The wondérfully liberal king of the Jews presented to Greek cities, including Athens and Sparta, temples, theatres, games, porticoes,

[1] Building of the temple, *Ant.* 15, 11. Also Ewald, B.C. 20. Grätz, B.C. 22—14. Protection of foreign Jews, *Ant.* 16, 2, 3 sqq.; 16, 6, 1 sqq.; Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* (Frankfort ed.), pp. 1014 sq., 1033, 1035. Augustus (amazed at the empty Holy of Holies) and Agrippa, in Philo, pp. 1032 sq., 1035; Jos. *B. J.* 1, 20, 4; *Ant.* 15, 10, 3; 16, 2. Comp. Suet. *Oct.* 93. Agrippa's wing, *B. J.* 1, 21, 1. The date, comp. Gerlach, pp. 13 sqq.

[2] *B. J.* 1, 21, 7; *Ant.* 15, 9, 6. Comp. Suet. *Octav.* 60.

[3] *B. J.* 1, 21, 2, 3; *Ant.* 15, 8, 5; 15, 10, 1, 3. Throughout the land, *B. J.* 1, 21, 4. Comp. Grätz, III. p. 183.

[4] *B. J.* 1, 21, 8; *Ant.* 15, 9, 6.

gymnasia, baths, aqueducts, walls, even marble pavement for the streets. He gave land, made presents of money and provisions, imposed taxes for the building of fleets, paid the salaries of gymnasiarchs, and contributed to the Olympian games. His delight in being recognized by foreigners—which made him amends for, and even gave him a sense of security against, Jewish misconception—was marred only by the fear of arousing envy or suspicion, not only because he was more beneficent to those abroad than to those at home, but also because he put his foreign masters themselves to shame.[1] It would have been a marvel if this excessive tendency to favour the Gentiles had not spread inwards from the circumference to the centre, if Herod, by a triumph of policy over passion, had allowed the holy soil of Jerusalem to remain in its virgin purity. He was hindered from sacrificing passion to policy by his desire to offer to the Greeks, the Romans, Agrippa, every comfort in his own capital; and also by his inward displeasure at the ever-renewed exhibition of Jewish refractoriness, which drew from him the open avowal that he greatly preferred the Greeks to the Jews.[2] It is true that in Jerusalem there stood no temple to the gods of earth and heaven. As a substitute, Herod founded quinquennial gladiatorial combats in honour of Augustus and of the battle of Actium, and built a theatre, magnificent with stones, gold, silver, and wardrobe; this theatre was adorned with paintings of the deeds of Augustus, and hung with the trophies of his battles, while, in the lack of Jewish plays, there was a good Gentile repertory. An extensive amphitheatre was erected in the plain not far from the city; and soon, in that unwonted place, men gazed with astonishment upon all the arts and games of the Greeks and Romans, from gladiatorial contests to the rarest of fights with wild beasts—a marvel even to the Gentiles.[3] The temple of God could not defend itself against the spirit of the

[1] *B. J.* 1, 21, 11, 12; *Ant.* 15, 9, 5; 16, 5, 3, 4. [2] *Ant.* 19, 7, 3.

[3] *Ant.* 15, 8, 1. "The plain" appears to be in the neighbourhood (see also Ewald, IV. p. 560), and therefore is not the Philistian; comp. Winer, article *Thäler*.

age: it not only received within its walls a number of trophies of barbaric plunder, but over its main entrance was ostentatiously displayed the symbol of Rome, a great golden eagle.[1] The royal household at Jerusalem, the life at court, the magnificent new residence in the upper city, the whole character of the government—everything exhibited a foreign modification of the oriental type: there were 400 Gallic royal guards inherited from Cleopatra, body-guards of all kinds, Thracian and Germanic divisions, native troops—all excellent warriors; there were hundreds of court servants, eunuchs, soothsayers, and Chaldeans; there were men of Greek culture, such as the Peripatetic orator and historian, Nicolaus of Damascus, and his brother Ptolemy, the orator Irenæus, the Lacedæmonian parasite Eurycles, foreign ambassadors and guests coming and going, especially at the numerous feasts. Many new friends of Judaism were called satirically the proselytes of the royal table.[2] The princes received Greek and Roman names, Greco-Roman education, which they completed at the high school, Rome. The king himself delighted to make an appearance, from time to time, as an orator. He often displayed enlightenment side by side with superstition; concerning terrible earthquakes, in which the people of old had always recognized the signs of God, he gave the reassuring explanation that they were the result of chance. He regarded the angels of God, who gave the Law at Sinai, as closely allied to human ambassadors. He absolved from obedience to the Law, not only others, but also himself, marrying Malthace, a Samaritan woman, while his son Alexander married a woman of Cappadocia, whose children grew up as Gentiles. Unlawful marriages were characteristic of the whole house. Violations of married women and of virgins were common. But an excellently well organized secret police kept watch over public discipline, and inexorable quæstors enforced the payment of the taxes and imposts. Herod broke the law in certain of his own laws; as, for

[1] *Ant.* 15, 11, 3; 17, 6, 2.

[2] Gere shuelchan melachim. Grätz, p. 308.

example, when, to the displeasure of the people, he allowed the thief to be sold to the foreigner; he himself countenanced theft, as the sacrilegious pillager of David's tomb.[1] He proved to the people his presumptuous disregard of religion most clearly by his treatment of its chief organs. Instead of members of the distinguished hierarchical families, he appointed persons of inferior condition or foreign priests to the high-priesthood from which he himself was excluded; and, contrary to all ancient customs, he appointed and deposed the high-priests according to his caprice—thus doing what Antiochus Epiphanes had hardly done. He reduced the Sanhedrim of the Maccabæans to a nullity, and called his creatures to pronounce arbitrary judicial decisions.[2]

These very extravagances and perversities show that the external splendour of the reign of Herod was much greater than its real and solid prosperity, although Herod himself wished to

[1] Body-guard, eunuchs, *Ant.* 15, 7, 3; 16, 8, 1; 17, 8, 3; 17, 10, 3. Surrounding, 16, 5, 1; 17, 9, 5. Soothsayers (under Achelaus), *B. J.* 2, 7, 3. Nicolaus (a Jew), *Ant.* 16, 7, 1 (a Gentile according to Grätz, but see 16, 2, 4). Irenæus, 17, 9, 4. Eurycles (a Greek), 16, 10, 1. Sons, 15, 10, 1; 16, 7, 3; 16, 8, 3; 17, 1, 3. Herod as an orator, *e. g.* 15, 11, 1. His enlightenment, 15, 5, 3. The angel, *ib.* Marriage to Samaritan woman, 17, 1, 3. Alexander, 18, 5, 4. Comp. Salome, 15, 7, 10. Violation, 17, 11, 2. Police, 15, 8, 4; 15, 10, 4. Tax-collectors, 17, 11, 2. Law concerning thieves, 16, 1, 1. Theft at David's tomb, 16, 7, 1.

[2] The high-priests: (1) Ananel of Babylon, 15, 2, 4; 15, 3, 1. (2) Aristobulus the Asmonæan, 15, 3, 1. (3) Ananel (again), 15, 3, 3. (4) Jesus, the son of Phabet, 15, 9, 3. (5) Simon of Alexandria, the son of Boethus (*cir.* B.C. 24), 15, 9, 3. (6) Matthias, the son of Theophilus, 17, 4, 2. (7) Joazar, the son of Boethus, 17, 6, 4; 17, 13, 1. Of the Sanhedrim in Herod's time and later, there is some mention in the New Testament (Matt. xxvi. 59, comp. ii. 4; Mark xiv. 55; Acts iv. 5, v. 34), and also in Josephus (*Ant.* 20, 9, 1, 6; *B. J.* 4, 5, 4); but it is either an incompetent assembly, or is arbitrarily called together *ad hoc.* "Of a (proper, legislative) Sanhedrim there is no trace throughout the whole of the Herodian and Roman periods," Jost, 1857, p. 278. Herod put the Sanhedrists to death (*Ant.* 14, 9, 4); and the Roman Gabinius had already substituted for the one Sanhedrim five local ones (Divide et impera), (*Ant.* 14, 5, 4; *B. J.* 1, 8, 5), which, however, had but a temporary existence. Grätz, III. p. 145. More in detail below, when speaking of the Romans and the trial of Jesus. Simon, the son of Boethus, had the surname Κανθηρᾶς (comp. κάνθαρος, perhaps with Egyptian signification), and flourished from Augustus until Claudius; comp. *Ant.* 19, 6, 2 and 4; 20, 1, 3. Does he not remind us of the otherwise intangible Alexander, Acts iv. 6? Then we should have in the New Testament not only a Boethian, but also Boethians and Sadducees in league together.

have his reign regarded as the most glorious period in the history of Israel. Herod was not devoid of nobler qualities, though his possession of such qualities has been forgotten by both Jews and Christians. He was something more than a mere brave general, a bold hunter and rider, and a sagacious ruler; he possessed a large-heartedness and an innate nobility of mind which qualified him to be a benefactor to his people. This fundamental characteristic of his nature, an inheritance from his father, is admitted times out of number by the Jewish historian, and was often exhibited by Herod in his piety towards his father, mother, brothers, and also towards his friends, as well as in his generosity in both good fortune and adversity. When he took Jerusalem in B. C. 37, he repressed unnecessary cruelty, with the noble words, that the empire of the world would be no compensation to him for the death of so many citizens. When, in the thirteenth year of his reign (B.C. 25), several years before the building of the temple, famine and disease devastated the land, he impoverished himself by disposing of the gold and silver of his household treasures; he ordered out of Egypt great quantities of corn which he dispersed to the people and caused to be made into bread; he clothed the poor, and at his own cost supported 50,000 men; he even sent help to the Syrian towns, and thus became a second Joseph in the temporary, nay enduring, gratitude of the people.[1] Yet his was only the large-heartedness of a barbarian, without true culture or intrinsic morality. Hence his unscrupulousness in the use of means, his want of consideration for the peculiarities of the nationality which he governed, and the low cunning and the vanity which marked his conduct; hence, especially in later life, his subjection to caprice, anger, remorse, mistrust and cruelty, and to the artifices of women and eunuchs. He was, in short, only the petty ruler, the successful adventurer, at once recklessly and apprehensively self-seeking, a

[1] Opinion as to the value of his government, *Ant.* 15, 11, 1. Magnanimity, 16, 5, 4; *B. J.* 1, 21, 12. Generosity even in adversity, 14, 14, 3. His great saying, 14, 16, 3. The famine, 15, 9, 1, 2. Enduring gratitude, 15, 9, 5.

beggar at the feet of Augustus, a foolish sycophant towards the Greco-Roman world, a tyrant in his own house, and incapable either of resisting external influences or of enduring contradiction. With great parts, he was nevertheless a little man and even a little ruler, whose finest sayings were uttered only to condemn himself.

His lavish expenditure exhausted the land. Even Augustus and Agrippa were wont to say that Herod's territory was too small for his magnificence,—only the addition of the kingdoms of Syria and Egypt would suffice for his undertakings. The large cities might continue to flourish: Herod, when he began to build the temple, might boast of the benefits of the long peace, the wealth at his disposal, and the greatness of the national income; but the taxes were also enormous, and in spite of the repeated remission of a third or a fourth part, were so exorbitant, that after the king's death the people tumultuously demanded that they should be lightened. The taxation was most minute,—the most necessary market wares had their imposts; and those imposts were unrelentingly collected. There existed a frightful system of proscription after the Roman manner, by which the king satisfied his lust for blood as well as for money; and a hateful system of bribery, which began with the king, spread among his counsellors and judges, and reached even to the slaves who collected the taxes. The country was particularly exasperated by the drain of gold into other lands: an embassy to the emperor afterwards complained that Herod had never ceased to adorn foreign cities, while those of his own land had consequently fallen into decay, and the whole nation, which he had found in a flourishing condition, had been reduced to beggary.[1]

With the extortion of money was intimately connected the iron pressure of a tyranny that was described by the people

[1] The saying of Augustus', *Ant.* 16, 5, 1. Revenue, 15, 11, 1. Riches in Cæsarea, 20, 8, 7, Imposts, 16, 5, 4; 17, 11, 2. Market commodities, 17, 8, 4. Remission, 15, 10, 4; 16, 2, 5. Proscriptions, 15, 1, 2; 17, 11, 2. Corruption and complaints, *ib.*

themselves as a combination of all the forms of despotic government, aggravated by inventions of his own.[1] In fact, he combined with all the evil customs of the East, the new principle of the West—the right of the strongest. The dangers to which the upstart was exposed from the former royal house and the national aversion, the dissensions of his numerous family, the intrigues of a court of women, eunuchs, barbers, and fawning flatterers of every description, drove him, as with demoniacal force, from one stage of cruelty to another.[2] The arrogance of the youth who marched upon Jerusalem with an army, became unbridled licence in the man, and refinement of caprice and lust in his later years. His entry into Jerusalem in B.C. 37, and the execution of Antigonus (the nephew of Hyrcanus) and his dependents, were followed by daily executions.[3] Of all the members of the Sanhedrim which had sat in judgment against him when a youth, he allowed but one to remain alive—Shemaiah the Pharisee; and he is said even to have put out the eyes of Hillel's gentle-natured scholar, Jochanan, the son of Zacchæus, and to have afterwards gone to him for advice.[4] While he made use of flattery abroad, he sought to protect himself at home by terror. He encircled the land with bulwarks against revolt, the most important of which bulwarks were at Jerusalem, Bethlehem (the fortress Herodion), and Samaria; and no one believed that these fortifications were intended merely for the defence of the land.[5] He pardoned no one whom he suspected; he enforced obedience by an oath, and whoever would not swear lost his life. Many died horribly in the fortress of Hyrcania. To be detected either meeting or standing together, by his countless spies in the city and on the highways, or by himself in his nocturnal rounds,

[1] *Ant.* 17, 11, 2.

[2] A barber does in fact appear in this history, *ib.* 16, 11, 5, 6.

[3] *Ib.* 15, 1, 1, 2. Comp. the sons of Baba slain after a twelve years' concealment, 15, 7, 10.

[4] Sanhedrim, *ib.* 14, 9, 4. Comp. Lightfoot, p. 259. Jost, 1857, p. 269.

[5] *Ant.* 15, 8, 4, 5; 15, 11, 1. The Maccabæan fortresses of Hyrcania, Alexandrion, Machærus, and Masada, were also newly fortified.

involved the forfeiture of life.[1] The most revolting feature of Herod's reign was his bloody decimation of his own family. About B.C. 35, he caused his wife's brother Aristobulus, who had been high-priest for eighteen years, to be suffocated in a pond at Jericho by his Gallic guards, because Aristobulus was popular and belonged to the old family; in B.C. 31, after the battle of Actium, which threatened to prove dangerous to him, he put to death his grandfather-in-law, the octogenarian Hyrcanus. The same fate befel his wife Mariamne in B.C. 30 or 29, her intriguing mother Alexandra a little later, his brother-in-law Costobarus in B.C. 25, and a long list of friends. About B.C. 6, Alexander and Aristobulus, the sons of Mariamne, were judicially condemned and strangled in Samaria. And, finally, Herod put to death the diabolical Antipater, his son by his first wife, and who with Salome and Alexandra, Herod's sister and mother-in-law, had been the chief instigator of the family crimes. After having been incited to the committal of evil deeds, Herod always relapsed into the bitterest repentance: he bewailed the depravity of his house; he cried aloud for Mariamne, whose place was filled about B.C. 24 by a second wife; he called for his sons, whose spirits haunted him. It was a witticism of Augustus', who often composed Herod's family disputes, but at last abandoned even the sons to their father's will: It is better to be one of Herod's swine than his son. Antipater's execution took place during the king's last illness, five days before his death. At the same time, Herod caused the chief men of Israel to be brought together in the hippodrome at Jericho, that they might be shot at his death; however much men hated him, he was determined they should do him "the honour" of weeping. The fact can hardly be disputed; but it was the act of his last delirium, and after his death Salome released the prisoners under the plea that the king had altered his purpose.[2]

[1] *Ant.* 15, 9, 5; 15, 10, 4.

[2] Death of Aristobulus, *ib.* 15, 3, 3. Of Hyrcanus, 15, 6, 1. Of Mariamne, Alexandra, the friends, 15, 7, 1—10. The sons of Mariamne, 16, 11, 1—7. The

But the nation felt itself still more deeply injured in its most sacred sentiments by the king's reckless and utterly law-ignoring Hellenism. The mistrust of the people and their aversion to Herod were as tenacious and unyielding as their national faith; and their religious instinct penetrated all the attempts to hide the revolt against religion behind the outward homage paid to the national God by Herod, and even by the emperor, his court, and his statesmen.[1] The nation openly mourned over the destruction of its customs, over the decline of its religion,—a decline the evidences of which were everywhere to be found, from the murder of the members of the national royal house by him who was once its "servant," to the illegal games in the theatre.[2] If the ambitious king silently wished that the people should dedicate statues and temples to him, as he had lavishly done to his Roman masters, the people on their part were far more disposed to break forth into angry violence against the profanations which threatened to bring upon the whole land the punishment of the King of kings. It was suspected that human images were concealed among the trophies in the theatre; the unanimous cry arose that such images would not be tolerated in the holy city; and the king, constrained to pacify the people, caused some of the trophies to be removed in order that every one might see that no human image lurked under the weapons. Many were pacified; but ten citizens conspired to stab Herod in the temple. The secret police got scent of the plot; Herod hastened back to the palace, and the ten were cruelly executed; but the informer was torn to pieces by the people, and thrown to

second Mariamne, see below. Antipater, *Ant.* 17, 7. Jericho, 17, 6, 5. The malignant influence of the women and the son, *B. J.* 1, 22, 1 sqq.; *Ant.* 16, 7, 2—5, &c. Augustus' saying: Melius est Herodis porcum esse, quam filium, in Macrob. *Saturnal.* 2, 4.

[1] Comp. Agrippa's sacrifice. *Ant.* 16, 2, 1.

[2] The mourning, *ib.* 15, 8, 1, 4; 15, 9, 5; 15, 10, 4. Comp. the anger of the Rabbis against the *servus*, Lightfoot, p. 259. The games contrary to law, *Ant.* 15, 8, 1.

the dogs.[1] During Herod's last illness, two teachers of the Law, —Judas, son of Sariphæus, and Matthias, son of Margalothus,— believing him to be dead, instigated the youth who were zealous for the Law, by the promise of eternal life, to break to pieces with axes the proud heathen eagle over the temple gate. When arrested, they courageously declared that Moses was greater than a king. An intimidated tribunal at Jericho condemned them: Matthias and several others were burnt, and about forty executed; the high-priest Matthias, being suspected, was superseded by Joazar, the still more servile son of Boethus; and no one ventured to complain.[2] The Pharisees to the number of more than 6000, as well as many others who followed their example, never took the oath to the emperor and the king; and Herod, who in other cases had enforced the oath by terror, did not venture to lay his hands upon the Pharisees: the fine which he imposed was paid for the sect by his own sister-in-law, the wife of his brother Pheroras. Perhaps it was only the respectful consideration with which Herod treated the leaders, Pollio (Abtalion) the Pharisee, and his scholar Sameas (Shemaiah), that prevented an already possible serious catastrophe. Yielding to circumstances, and confident of the ways of that Providence which miraculously protected and favoured the king, Sameas, in the Sanhedrim that trembled before the governor of Galilee, had proclaimed Herod to be the rod of divine punishment; and, on the same grounds, at the time of the siege of Jerusalem, he agreed with Pollio, in opposition to the sons of Baba, in advising the opening of the gates to Herod.[3] It is true, however, that the Pharisees were hoping the arm of God would destroy the rod of punishment with the whole of his family; and they secretly promised the crown and their children, in God's name, to the house of Pheroras. This, indeed, first led to the execution of

[1] *Ant.* 15, 8, 1—4. [2] *Ib.* 17, 6, 2 sqq.

[3] *Ib.* 14, 9, 4; 15, 1, 1; 15, 7, 10 (Baba); 15, 10, 4; 17, 2, 4. Miraculous protection, 14, 15, 11, 13.

many Pharisees. But must not Herod himself at last fall a victim to the flames which had consumed his sacrilegious companions at the plundering of the tomb of David?[1]

Herod the Great's own hour came. Unhappy in mind, repeatedly altering his last testament because he mistrusted his sons, and finally consumed by a frightful intestinal disease, the new Antiochus died miserably at an age of nearly seventy years, under the palms of Jericho (before the Passover, B.C. 4), issuing in his fury bloodthirsty mandates, while seers were pointing at his sufferings as divine judgments.[2]

The external brilliance which marked the reign of the Idumæan vanished with the dead man's funeral, which, with the corpse laid on a golden bier, and decked with purple, crown, sceptre, and jewels, and accompanied by an escort of incense-bearing courtiers and barbarian warriors, again brought the pomp of royalty before the nation.[3] As Herod had anticipated, the day of his death was a day of rejoicing to the Jews; the kingdom came to an end, was divided, shattered; Herod's sons finally ate the bread of exile, his numerous family became extinct in less than a hundred years, and a curse lay upon his house.[4] Of the six sons who, with five daughters, remained to him from ten almost contemporary marriages, he had finally given the preference to Archelaus, the son of Malthace the Samaritan woman, and had, in his will, appointed him to be king.[5] In order

[1] *Ant.* 17, 2, 4. Grave, 16, 7, 1.

[2] *Ib.* 17, 6—8. The death immediately before Easter, 17, 9, 3. The year B.C. 4, or A.U.C. 750, is obtained by means of the years of the reigns of his successors (see below). The calculation of Josephus (34 years after the death of Antigonus, B.C. 37 =B.C. 3, 4, and 37 years after Herod's becoming king, B.C. 40=B.C. 3) is at least in general agreement with this. *Ant.* 17, 8, 1.

[3] *Ib.* 17, 8, 3 sq., buried at Herodion, near Bethlehem.

[4] *Ib.* 18, 5, 3. The day of festival, *B. J.* 1, 33, 6; comp. Gratz, III. p. 426.

[5] Herod's marriages: (1) Doris: son, Antipater. (2) Mariamne, granddaughter of Hyrcanus: sons, Aristobulus and Alexander; daughters, Salampsio and Kypros. (3) Mariamne, daughter of Simon the high-priest (after B.C. 24): son, Herod, the first husband of Herodias. (4) Malthace, the Samaritan: sons, Archelaus, Antipas; daughter, Olympias. (5) Cleopatra of Jerusalem: sons, Herod and Philip. (6)

to be able to assume the crown, Archelaus was compelled at once to make amends to the people for the sins of his father,—to comply with every demand, to diminish the taxes, to abolish the market-toll, and to release the numerous prisoners. But the agitation grew: the people began to lament with loud outcries the execution of the scribes; they spoke revilingly of the late king, and demanded of Archelaus that he should punish his father's counsellors, and depose Joazar the new high-priest. It was useless to attempt to appease them; their long-repressed passions had at last found vent: the teachers of the Law, who were more certain of their aim than were the people, also agitated. At the Passover, B.C. 4 (A.U.C. 750), an open revolt took place: a cohort was stoned by the people, in order that the latter might kill their Passover lamb in peace; but the slayers became the sacrifice, and nearly 3000 men were put to death in the temple.[1]

After this ghastly celebration of the great festival, Archelaus went to Rome to obtain from Augustus the indispensable confirmation of his father's will. Philip was left as administrator of the kingdom. Archelaus' conduct did him but little credit; the people, even the family, hated him as the son of the Samaritan, but yet more as a cruel tyrant and a genuine Herod. Antipas, his younger full brother, secretly supported by his relations, especially by Salome, and even by the people, travelled to Rome as his open rival, in order to induce Augustus to

Pallas: son, Phasael. (7) Phædra: daughter, Roxana. (8) Elpis: daughter, Salome. (9) and (10) Brother's daughter and a niece: no children. *B. J.* 1, 28, 4; *Ant.* 17, 1, 3; 18, 5, 4 (here also the later family relationships, especially those of the kindred dynasties of Asia Minor). The extinction of the family *cir.* A.D. 100, see Josephus, *Vit.* 65. Agrippa II., the great-grandson of Herod the Great, survived till the time of Trajan (third year of Trajan's reign, Phot. *Bibl.* cap. 33). The emendation defended by Grätz (p. 410) of Τραϊανοῦ into τοῦ αὐτοῦ (Vespasian), according to which Agrippa died A.D. 71—72, is proved by Josephus, *Vit.* 65, to be altogether untenable; for Josephus represents Agrippa as surviving at any rate to the time of the Greek translation of the *Wars of the Jews* (not earlier than A.D. 75), and as having lived to a great age. But when the *Vita* is written, Agrippa and his kindred are dead.

[1] *Ant.* 17, 8, 4; 17, 9, 1—3.

recognize Herod's first will, in which, out of hatred to Archelaus and Philip, Antipas was made heir to the throne. The first wish of the people was to have no Herod at all, but freedom and a Roman governor: at the worst they preferred Antipas to Archelaus.

Through their advocates, Herod's sons quarrelled in the presence of Augustus. Antipas took advantage of all his brother's defects, while Archelaus supported his claim on the fact that he was named in his father's *last* will. At the same time, the reports of the governor of Syria concerning the resources of the kingdom begot a desire to collect fresh tribute. The emperor, out of regard for the memory of Herod, who in an almost affecting manner had in his will bequeathed an immense sum of money to his Roman patron, decided the painful strife in favour of Archelaus. Raising him from the ground, he declared him to be the worthier, but postponed the final judgment.[1]

Unfortunately, at this crisis, fresh intelligence arrived from Judæa. The whole nation was in revolt, either against the absent Archelaus, or against the Romans who had begun to feel their position secure. Quinctilius Varus, the active governor of Syria, who had been consul in B.C. 13, and was ultimately the victim of the war with the Germans, found himself at first surrounded by the insurrection; but he suppressed it, punished its authors, and then retired to Antioch, leaving a legion behind him in Jerusalem.[2] But the order which Varus had with difficulty restored, was now destroyed by a violent and avaricious imperial treasurer, Sabinus, procurator of Syria, who, while Archelaus was travelling to Rome, made his appearance first in Cæsarea and then in Jerusalem, in order to secure what Herod had left behind him, the forts, castles, and treasures—

[1] *Ant.* 17, 9.

[2] Concerning Varus (in Syria at least from B.C. 6, *Ant.* 17, 5, 2, 7; comp. Gerlach, pp. 20 sqq.), see Vellei. Pat. 2, 117: Syriam (divitem pauper ingressus) pauperem reliquit.

scarcely with the view of ensuring a just partition.[1] Sabinus did not understand the people. Collecting an army, he marched through the land, and played the despot and the plunderer by seizing the royal fortresses and treasures. It was less religion than hatred of the Romans that drew together in Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost (B.C. 4) hundreds of thousands of Jews, Idumæans, and men from Jericho, Peræa, and Galilee. The multitude encamped in three divisions; a desperate struggle broke out. The Romans set fire to the temple courts, many lives were lost, many persons destroyed themselves; Sabinus pillaged the temple treasures, on which, fifty years before (B.C. 54), Crassus, the robber of £2,000,000, had laid his hands. The Jews did not submit, but besieged Sabinus. Complete disorganization prevailed throughout the whole land; Herod's disbanded soldiers plundered in Judæa; in Galilee, Judas the robber-captain, son of the great robber-captain Hezekiah, armed his followers from the royal arsenals of Sepphoris; robbers and slaves, the most prominent of whom was Simon, who was dreaded even by the Romans, mingled in the general confusion, and crowned themselves in feeble imitation of the deceased adventurer.[2] The governor Varus, however, appeared from Syria with a multitude of troops,—two legions, cavalry, kings, tetrarchs, and furious Arabs; his son fell upon the Galileans, and destroyed their chief town, Sepphoris, where Judas had entrenched himself; while Varus himself marched through Samaria towards Jerusalem, scattering the insurgents and crushing the insurrection, the real instigator of which, Sabinus, quietly withdrew to the Mediterranean. After inflicting a frightful punishment (2000 crucifixions!), Varus gained yet more by his gentleness: he allowed the

[1] *Ant.* 17, 9, 3 : ἐπίτροπος τῶν καίσαρος πραγμάτων ; 17, 10, 1. Comp. Gerlach, *Die röm. Statthalter in Syrien und Palästina*, p. 19.

[2] As to Simon, comp.—besides *Ant.* 17, 10, 6—Tac. *Hist.* 5, 9 : Post mortem H. nihil exspectato Cæsare Simo quidam regium nomen invaserat. Crassus, *Ant.* 14, 7, 1. After the soldiers had plundered, Sabinus saved for himself 400 talents (about £80,000), 17, 10, 2.

Jerusalemites, who laid the blame upon the people out of Jerusalem, to bring their requests peaceably before the emperor.[1]

Fifty envoys went to Rome, where 8000 Jews joined the procession into the city. The emperor received them in the temple of Apollo. They made loud complaints over the unhappy period of Herod's reign: he had crushed the nation by taxes, corruption, avarice, cruelty, and immorality. At no period of their history, not even after their return from exile, had the nation been more wretched: only the dead were happy. Archelaus had at first been joyfully welcomed, but he had proved to be a true son of his father. The people desired only one thing: namely, to be delivered from royalty, from such rulers as Herod and Archelaus, and to be annexed to Syria, and thus to be under the rule of the governor of Syria.[2]

Archelaus was compelled to hear all this. His advocate Nicolaus defended him; but he had nothing to oppose to the damning fact that his people strongly preferred foreign to native rule, even after the violent invasion of the Roman legions. The national instinct had rightly divined that the rule of a Roman governor, with all its arbitrariness and extortion, must be beneficial in comparison with that of a king intoxicated with power and at issue with the nation; while the greater distance of the ruler, the protection to nationality and property guaranteed by Roman law, and chiefly the tolerant principles of Augustus, and even his favourable disposition towards the Jews and the temple, still further encouraged the people to urge their petition.[3] The emperor, on his part, was finally influenced, not merely by consideration for the house of Herod, but also by the difficulties of dealing with this peculiar people, and by a desire to avoid an increase of the burdens which already oppressed the government of the East: Herod's own will afforded him the means of avoiding every danger, and the division of the land into three parts (Gabinius' old plan) satisfied the contending

[1] *Ant.* 17, 10; 17, 11, 1.

[2] *Ib.* 17, 11, 1, 2.

[3] See below, concerning Augustus, pp. 263, 264.

princes, delivered the people from any ambitious dreams of their rulers, weakened the forces available for rebellion, and secured dependence upon Rome. Some days after the audience of the envoys, the emperor, guided by Herod's will, appointed Archelaus ethnarch (ruler of the nation) of Judæa, Idumæa, and Samaria; the other half of the kingdom he divided into tetrarchies (fourth part of a land, under its own ruler), one of which—Galilee and Peræa—he gave to Antipas, and the other—Batanæa, Trachonitis, and Gaulonitis—to Philip, who at that time made his appearance in Rome under the patronage of Varus. Following Pompey's precedent, he re-annexed to Syria several Greek cities, former acquisitions of the Asmonæans—Gaza, Gadara, and Hippo. Archelaus was satisfied: he retained the important cities of Jerusalem, Sebaste, Cæsarea, and Joppa, and the largest revenues—600 talents, or about £120,000—while Antipas, had but a third of that amount, and Philip only a sixth; moreover, Augustus promised that he should retain the title of king, subject to his good behaviour. The rest of the family also received portions of the inheritance, especially Salome, the king's sister, to whom Augustus granted more than was prescribed by the will. Augustus renounced the bequests to himself, with the exception of a few souvenirs.[1]

The conduct of Archelaus, however, was not satisfactory. In his hands, the gentleness prescribed by the emperor became tyranny towards the Jews as well as towards the Samaritans. Besides being cruel, he was a sensual Idumæan; he revelled in

[1] *Ant.* 17, 11, 4, 5; *B. J.* 2, 6, 3. The partition in accordance with the will, 17, 8, 1. The first will (appointing Antipas king), 17, 6, 1. Tac. *Hist.* 5, 9: Gentem coercitam liberi Herodis tripartito rexere. The three cities belonged to the Asmonæan dominion, *Ant.* 13, 15, 4. Pompey, 14, 4, 4. Concerning the titles ethnarch and tetrarch, comp. Winer. Archelaus had more than £120,000, Antipas above £40,000, and Philip £20,000. Salome's inheritance consisted of the Philistian Jamnia and the whole district belonging to it, Ashdod, Phasælis (valley of Jericho), and much money; to which Augustus added the royal fortress of Ascalon, *Ant.* 17, 6, 1; 17, 8, 1; 17, 11, 5; 18, 2, 2; *B. J.* 2, 9, 1. The colossal presents to the imperial house, 17, 8, 1; 17, 11, 5. Pheroras had the tetrarchy of Peræa, under Herod, his brother, 15, 10, 3.

banquets, and licentiously put away his wife Mariamne in order to marry the Cappadocian princess Glaphyra, the widow of his murdered brother Alexander. He offended against the Law both by this marriage with his brother's widow, who was not childless, and who quickly pined away out of remorse for her fresh unfaithfulness to Alexander; as well as by trifling with the high-priest's office, which, after his father's example, he thrice disposed of, conferring it upon his creatures of the house of Boethus.[1] He satisfied his passion for architecture by designs for the palace in Jericho, and by the creation of Archelais. Dissatisfaction found a peaceful expression in the tenth year of his reign (summer, A.D. 6, 7), when the Jews and also the favoured Samaritans, acting in concert with the brothers of Archelaus, and relying upon the emperor's good wishes for the land, sent ambassadors to Rome.[2] The emperor was so displeased, that, without troubling himself to send a letter, he charged Archelaus' representative in Rome to summon that prince at once thither from Judæa. A dream, and its interpretation by Simon the Essene, had prepared Archelaus for the worst. The emperor heard him, banished him to Vienne, confiscated his possessions, and annexed the whole land, together with the holy city, to the province of Syria. A procurator, possessing the right of life and death, and with great powers in other respects, was to exercise immediate authority through the land, under the oversight of the imperial governor of Syria. Salome, Archelaus' hostile aunt, was enriched with Archelais, near Jericho, and its palm groves. The long-suffering of Augustus was converted into a violent storm. The desire of the people was at last fulfilled;

[1] First Joazar, appointed by his father, then Joazar's brother Eleazar, *Ant.* 17, 13, 1; then (*ib.*) Jesus, son of Sie; then again Joazar, 18, 1, 1. (Ewald says, without warrant, that this was done by the Romans.)

[2] Augustus had, at the very first, remitted to the Samaritans a fourth of their tribute to Archelaus, because they had remained quiet in the war with Varus, *Ant.* 17, 11, 4. Hence the turbulence under Coponius, 18, 2, 2. The tenth year, 17, 3, 2 (the ninth, *B. J.* 2, 7, 3) = A. U. C. 759, 760 = A.D. 6, 7. Ewald, IV. p. 645, gives A.D. 5; Grätz, p. 204, A.D. 7.

and the sorrows that now rose upon them were embittered by the reflection that they had so willed it.[1]

The very first year (A.D. 7, the thirty-seventh year after the battle of Actium) inaugurated the new rule with blood, the tragic beginning foreshadowing the end. P. Sulpicius Quirinius, a man of obscure origin, but whose merits had procured for him the dignities of consul (B.C. 12) and senator, who had repeatedly served in the East, was a brave soldier and a faithful servant of Augustus, and afterwards of Tiberius (Quirinius ob. A.D. 21), made his appearance as governor in Syria, commissioned by Augustus to take a valuation of the tax-paying capability of Syria and Judæa, and to confiscate the property of Archelaus. He came with Coponius, a knight who had been appointed procurator of Judæa, bringing a small force, and apparently without suspicion of the difficulties of the task.[2] The Jews, however,

[1] *Ant.* 17, 13, 2; 18, 2, 2; *B. J.* 2, 7, 3, 4. Procurator, comp. Tac. *Ann.* 15, 44; Jos. *B. J.* 2, 9, 2: ἐπίτροπος, ἐπιμελητὴς, *Ant.* 18, 4, 2; also ἔπαρχος, *Ant.* 18, 2, 2 (Philo, ὕπαρχος ἐπίτροπος, *Leg.* p. 1033); ἡγεμὼν, *Ant.* 18, 3, 1. The procurator's powers, *B. J.* 2, 8, 1; *Ant.* 18, 1, 1. Augustus personally furnished Syria, as *provincia validior*, with *legati Cæsaris*, *legati consulares*, *præsides*, *rectores*. Suet. *Oct.* 47, 88. Position of the procurators (special financial assistant of the governor, comp. Gabinus), see Winer, *Procuratoren*. Vitellius (who, however, possessed special authority, Tac. *Ann.* 6, 32) ventured even to suspend Pilate, *Ant.* 18, 4, 2. Salome, *Ant.* 18, 2, 2; *B. J.* 2, 9, 1; comp. *Ant.* 17, 13, 1. Concerning the procurators, comp. also Vol. II.

[2] Comp. as to Quirinius—besides Jos. *Ant.* 18, 1, 1—Tac. *Ann.* 2, 30; 3, 48: Sed (in spite of his descent) impiger militiæ et acribus ministeriis consulatum sub Divo Augusto (A. U. C. 742), mox expugnatis per Ciliciam Homonadensium castellis insignia triumphi adeptus, datusque rector C. Cæsari Armeniam obtinenti Tiberium quoque Rhodi agentem coluerat. C. Cæsar in Armenia after A. U. C. 753; ob. Feb. 757. Tib. at Rhodes, A. U. C. 748—755. Quir. was succeeded in his position as *rector* by M. Lollius about A. U. C. 754=A.D. 1. Suet. *Tib.* 12; Tac. *Ann.* 3, 48. Comp. Gerlach, pp. 42 sqq. According to Mommsen, however, *Res gestæ div. Aug.* 1865, pp. 123 sq., Quirinius followed Lollius. This is improbable. See the history of the birth. Therefore Quir. was in Armenia about A. U. C. 753, 754=B.C. 1—A.D. 1. Comp. also Suet. *Tib.* 49. The name is Quirinius, Κυρήνιος, Κυρίνιος (Strabo), in the best MSS. of Tacitus and the N. T. (also Sin.); on the other hand, Vat., It., Vulg., have Κυρεῖνος, Quirinus. Comp. Bleek, *Synopt.* I. 69. Mommsen, l. c. Gerlach, *Röm. Statthalter*, p. 36. Ewald, V. p. 16 (1st ed.). The date: Arch. deposed at end of A. U. C. 759 (summer 759, 760). Quir. and census, thirty-seven years after Actium=Sept. A. U. C. 759, 760; therefore Quir. hardly (Mommsen, pp. 115 sqq.) A. U. C. 759, but in the spring of 760.

both rich and poor, were at once opposed to a measure that proclaimed slavery instead of freedom, impoverishment instead of prosperity. The high-priest Joazar, son of the house of Boethus —a house that had been favourable to Herod and Rome—and who, under Herod and Archelaus, had repeatedly shown himself an apt tool for any breach of the law, at last succeeded in making the people assent to this artifice.[1] But his success was only partial. The resistance came from the circles of Jewish orthodoxy, from the Pharisees and the Scribes. Judas the Galilean (or Gaulonite)—not to be confounded with the robber's son Judas, who contended for the kingdom after the death of Herod —a native of Gamala, on the eastern side of the lake of Gennesareth, acting in concert with Zadok the Pharisee and disciple of Shammai, and himself a staunch Pharisee, declared the census to be an attack by the Roman empire upon the one King and Ruler of Israel. This party did not confine themselves to the schools, but appealed to the people, whom they summoned to exchange slavery for freedom, and to whom they promised the help of God, the one Lord, and eternal reward in case of death.[2] This was a welcome and popular appeal, doubly effective in the mouth of a Pharisee. In spite of the new faith in Rome, this appeal would have fired the whole land, had there not been a split among the Pharisees themselves, by which the moderate and sensible and politic were separated from the more violent men (Zealots, Kannaim). Nevertheless, Judas drew after him many from the schools, and a great number of the people. The insurrection assumed large dimensions. The goods of those persons who by obedience had placed themselves in the same category with the "Gentiles" were plundered, and their houses burnt, a prelude to the deeds of the future assassins (Sicarii). Quirinius, with his weak force, must at first have found himself

[1] *Ant.* 17, 6, 4; 17, 13, 1; 18, 1, 1.

[2] Grätz confounds this Judas with the robber's son; but the latter is very differently and much less favourably described by Josephus, *Ant.* 17, 10, 5. Grätz, p. 201. The Pharisaic element, *Ant.* 18, 1, 1, 6: *τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα τῇ γνώμῃ τῶν φαρισαίων ὁμολογοῦσι.* Zadok, disciple of Shammai, Grätz, p. 208.

in a strait, until probably assistance from Syria turned the scale; the rebellion was crushed, Judas fell, and nothing remained for his adherents to do but to exhibit that heroism of steadfast endurance of sufferings, and of the contemplation of the sufferings of kindred and friends, which even Josephus admired. Thus the census was "completed." But after its completion, Quirinius conceded to the people the deposition of Joazar, who had become hateful to them.[1] The silent wrath of the pious, however, remained, not merely against the odious word census, by which they afterwards called every money penalty, but also against the general fact of subjection to the Gentiles—a subjection of which they were reminded at every moment, even by the most inoffensive documents, in which the name of the emperor stood side by side with that of Moses. Josephus has called Judas' party the fourth religious sect or philosophy, those of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, forming the three others. If it is to be so called, it was *the* philosophy which exercised the strongest influence on every-day life, and maintained its principles with the greatest obstinacy; it was, in fact, simply—but the politic Pharisee Josephus is silent upon this point—unreserved Pharisaism, the Pharisaism which from the first declared war with Rome, and which, more influential than either of the other parties, was represented under each new emperor by new leaders, especially by Judas, who lived again in his sons and successors, James, Simon, Menahem, and Eleazar, with their cry of Freedom, and only one master, God! This Pharisaism was not silenced until Jerusalem was overthrown amidst all the horrors of fanaticism, and Eleazar at Masada, with the last thousand of free men, escaped servitude to Rome by their own swords. But the Galileans are mentioned even in the second century by Justin and Hegesippus, and also by the Talmud.[2]

[1] Not from an unknown cause. Ewald, V. p. 31.

[2] *Ant.* 17, 13, 5; 18, 11, 6; *B. J.* 2, 8, 1; 7, 8, 1. Also Acts v. 37 (with incorrect date, however, A.D. 40—50!). Joazar deposed, *Ant.* 18, 2, 1. The official documents (*e. g.* of divorce) mentioned God or Moses together with and after the emperor;

For the first seven years (A.D. 7—14) after their incorporation into the Roman empire, Judæa and Samaria prospered. It was a principle with Augustus to spare the provinces, and the frequent change of the Jewish procurators was in favour of this maxim.[1] In the religious question, which the decay of heathenism and the introduction of the religions of the East into the empire made a very exciting one, Augustus, himself enlightened, followed the counsels of Mæcenas, and adopted the course which for the moment was most politic, the prudent middle course.[2] He wished to uphold the religion of Rome, but also to preserve the native worship of the various provinces.[3] Personally, he despised the foreign religions; he offered no sacrifice in Jerusalem (B.C. 20), although he interested himself in making inquiries about the God of the Jews—a fact from which Philo drew too large inferences; and he commended his grandson, the young C. Cæsar, for passing Jerusalem (about the year of the birth of Jesus) as a Roman without offering sacrifice. On the other hand, however, like Cæsar and unlike Cicero, Augustus was anxious to do nothing to the prejudice of the Jewish religion; and so deep was this anxiety that, following Cæsar's precedent, he acceded to the petition of the Jewish government that he should in every way protect the Jews of the dispersion in their worship of God; he permitted the contributions and sacrificial embassies to the temple; the numerous Jews who, since the time of the campaigns of Pompey (B.C. 63) and Gabinius, had settled in Rome, the clients of Cæsar, he treated, in their spa-

Herzfeld, III. p. 386; Grätz, III. p. 209. We have not here to speak of the later zealots. But Josephus brings them everywhere into the closest connection with Judas, until the agitation spreads to Alexandria and elsewhere abroad, Jos. *B. J.* 7, 8—11. Justin, *Tryph.* 80. Hegesippus, ap. Eus. 4, 22.

[1] See the principles of Augustus, Dio Cass. 53, 23. Comp. Tac. *Ann.* 1, 9: Jus apud cives, modestiam apud socios. *Monum. Ancyr.* ed. Mommsen, 1865: Externas gentes, quibus tuto parcere potui, conservare quam excidere malui, III. p. 14.

[2] Dio Cass. 52, 36, 41.

[3] Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* p. 1014: τοσαύτην ποιεῖται τῆς βεβαιώσεως τῶν παρ' ἑκάστοις πατρίων, ὅσην καὶ τῶν ῥωμαϊκῶν. Comp. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2, 19.

cious quarter on the other side of the Tiber, with great consideration for their religion, their customs, and their prosperity; he gave his sanction to the Jewish council in Alexandria; and, finally, after the incorporation of Judæa, he endowed in perpetuity, at his own cost, a daily burnt-offering of an ox and two lambs, and, in addition, both he and the empress Livia, and other members of the house, sent sacred gifts in cups and vessels for use in the drink offering.[1] Thus he gained for himself the reputation of being in Rome the restorer, and in the provinces, especially among the Jews, the generous protector, of religion; whilst, in fact, this tolerance helped to make him serviceable in accomplishing a work which he had no intention of forwarding,—the slow but sure conquest of the Roman West, first by Judaism, the pioneer of the new and higher religion, and then by Christianity itself.[2]

Confining our attention to Palestine, we see that there must have been peaceful times under Augustus, since Philo could boast that during that emperor's reign no one in the wide Roman world dared to meddle with the Jews.[3] There were three procurators in quick succession—Coponius, Marcus Ambivius, and Annius Rufus, in whose time Augustus died (A.D. 14). Little more is known of them than their names, except that under Ambivius the empress Julia (Livia) inherited the possessions of Salome, the sister of Herod the Great. The tranquillity of their administration, in contrast with the later history of the procurator Pilate, proves that these governors respected

[1] Personal views of Augustus, Suet. *Octav.* 93, 96. Philo (p. 1035) knows nothing of a sacrifice by Augustus when in Syria. C. Cæsar, Suet. *Oct.* 93. The Jewish religion protected by Cæsar and others (*Ant.* 14, 8, 5; Suet. *Cæs.* 84), and Augustus (as well as Agrippa), *Ant.* 16, 2, 3 sqq.; 16, 6, 4 sqq. (comp. 12, 3, 2). Philo, *Leg.* pp. 1014 sq., 1035. Respect shown to the Sabbath observance of the Roman Jews in the monthly distributions of money and bread, *ib.* pp. 1014 sq. The sacrifice and the sacred gifts, *ib.* pp. 1014 sq., 1036. The earlier Gentile (Asiatic) rulers had also presented gifts to the temple, Jos. *Ant.* 13, 3, 4. Cicero's brutality towards the Jews (B.C. 59), *Orat. pro Flacc.* 28.

[2] Liv. 4, 20: Templorum conditor et restitutor. Vellei. 2, 89: Sacris honos restitutus. Comp. Horace, Suetonius, &c. Philo, *Leg.* p. 1014.

[3] *Ib.* p. 1015.

Judaism, so far even as to carry in the city standards without the image of the emperor.[1] The Jewish worship was compelled to submit to only one innovation after the incorporation into the empire: two sacrifices daily, and on feast-days hecatombs, were offered for the emperor and the Roman people, at the cost of the nation; in the synagogues also prayers were said for the emperor, and, "as far as the law permitted," the joys and sorrows of Rome were religiously recognized. This attitude towards heathenism was justified by the orthodox Jewish belief in the divine appointment even of servitude, and in divine instruments; whilst an alleviating circumstance was found in the fact that the emperor himself offered sacrifice, and was a Jew to the Jews.[2]

Tiberius, the successor of Augustus, changed at his accession to the throne (August, A.D. 14) the system of procurators, at first remarkably to the advantage of the province.[3] In the course of his twenty-two years' reign (A.D. 14—37) he appointed only two governors—Valerius Gratus, who held office for eleven years (A.D. 14—25), and Pontius Pilate, whose administration lasted ten years (A.D. 26—36).[4] The spirit of the government also changed with the long administrations and with the character of the empire itself.

In the first place, the tyrannical disposition of Tiberius extended to the provinces; and in the next place, the religious indifference of the emperor — who believed in nothing but destiny and mathematics—and the consequent hostility which he (in the spirit of Augustus, as he thought), annoyed by the

[1] Jos. *Ant.* 18, 2, 2; 18, 3, 1; *B. J.* 2, 9, 1.

[2] Jos. *B. J.* 2, 10, 4; 5, 13, 6; *Con. Ap.* 2, 6. Philo, *Leg.* p. 1031. Hecatombs for Caligula, thrice, *ib.* p. 1041. Mourning for Drusilla, Philo, *in Flacc.* p. 973. Prayers in the synagogues, *ib.* p. 972. Divine appointment, comp. Isaiah (xlv.), or the Pharisees, and Josephus. Tragic consciousness of subjection, Neh. ix. 36. Salva lege, Philo, *Leg.* p. 1031.

[3] Motive for change, *Ant.* 18, 6, 5. Tac. *Ann.* 1, 80. Suet. *Tib.* 32. Later indifference, *ib.* 41. Even Aug. is said to have altered his system after the *clades Vari* (A.D. 9). Suet. *Oct.* 23.

[4] This is also Ewald's calculation, V. pp. 33 sqq., and Gerlach's, l.c. p. 54. Grätz, III. pp. 211, 214, places Gratus A.D. 17—28, Pilate A.D. 28—37, in both cases falsely. Jos. *Ant.* 18, 2, 2.

extravagant zeal of certain scribes in making distinguished Roman proselytes (Fulvia), exhibited from A.D. 19 to A.D. 31, towards the Jewish colony in the capital, also favoured the encroachments of the governors in Palestine.[1] The subordinate rulers might have imagined that antagonism to the Jews would gratify the emperor, or his all-powerful minister Sejanus, even though the emperor desired to uphold substantially the rights of the temple, and as far as he could—according to Philo's expression—did uphold them throughout his reign.[2]

Valerius Gratus changed the high-priests four times during his first four years, until, about A.D. 18, he found in the Sadducee Joseph, called Caiaphas, a willing instrument: Caiaphas held the office until a few weeks after Pilate ceased to be procurator.[3] In consequence of the extortions of governors, procurators, and quæstors, the sighs of the nation for relief reached Rome as early as the first years of the rule of Valerius Gratus.[4] But more violent and sanguinary conflicts began under Pontius Pilate—whose character we shall consider further on—at first on account of the Roman standards, then of the use made of the temple moneys, and later on account of the dedication of golden shields in the palace at Jerusalem; towards the end of his administration, there were disturbances in Jerusalem, where he slew the Galileans who were sacrificing at a feast, and in Samaria, where he cruelly suppressed a religious agitation.[5] The details belong to the description of the state of religion. The turn of

[1] Irreligion of the emperor, Suet. 69: Circa Deos ac religiones negligentior, quippe addictus mathematicæ. Tac. *Ann.* 1, 73: Deorum injurias Diis curæ. Dio Cass, 57, 15. Expulsion of the Jews, Tac. *Ann.* 2, 85. Suet. 36. Philo, *Leg.* 1015. Jos. *Ant.* 18, 3. In the spirit of Augustus, Tac. *Ann.* 4, 37; 2, 49.

[2] Philo, *Leg.* pp. 1033 sq.

[3] *Ant.* 18, 2, 2. Grätz, III. 213: about A.D. 27—38! As to Caiaphas, comp. in the mean time, my *Gesch. Chr.* p. 239.

[4] Tac. *Ann.* 2, 42. Varus, an example of an extortionate governor of Syria, Vell. Pat. 2, 117: Pecuniæ quam non contemtor, Syria, cui præfuerat declaravit, quam pauper divitem ingressus dives pauperem reliquit. Similarly Philo, of a quæstor Capito, in Palestine (under Caligula), *Leg.* p. 1020. Similarly of Pilate, pp. 1033 sq.

[5] *Ant.* 18, 2, 2; 18, 3, 1, 2; 18, 4, 1. Philo, *Leg.* pp. 1033 sq.

affairs now made it possible for the sons of Herod the Great to stand forth as the protectors of the national religion against the Romans.[1] Moreover, the harsh, grasping, malignant tyrant soon learnt to respect the nation that was yet more unyielding than himself; and according to Philo's account, even the emperor in his later years, after the death of Sejanus in A.D. 31, became a patron and avowed protector of the religion that helped to preserve the peace of the state, and, by his strict prohibition of the decoration of the palace at Jerusalem, confirmed the governor's respect for the people.[2]

We see, then, that on the whole the Jewish worship continued to be carried on in peace. The feasts were celebrated as splendidly as ever, and even a Pilate was compelled to honour them by observing the graceful custom of granting a pardon at the Passover; but Roman troops—at least one thousand men, often more—kept guard in the temple courts and in the fort Antonia, which commanded the temple, in order to suppress insurrection; while the procurator, residing in Cæsarea with a chosen body of Romans, could make his appearance in Jerusalem, by way of Antipatris, in twenty-four hours; and even the governor of Syria often went up to the feasts, as on these occasions the nation was particularly disposed to reveal its temper.[3] Nothing stood in the

[1] It is a very significant fact that, in the disturbance about the shields of Pilate, the people of Jerusalem brought the four sons of Herod the Great and his surviving kindred into the field. Philo, p. 1034. This turn of affairs occurred under Caligula and Claudius.

[2] *Ant.* 18, 3, 1. Philo, p. 1034. See below—the religious condition of the Jews—for further details.

[3] *Ant.* 18, 2, 2; 20, 5, 3; *B. J.* 2, 12, 1. Residence at Cæsarea, *Ant.* 18, 3, 1. Philo, p. 1034. Jerusalem could be reached from Cæsarea, by forced marches, in twenty-four hours, Acts xxiii. 22—32. Antipatris (named after Herod's father), an intermediate station in Jos. *Ant.*, and in the Talmud (see, below, Caligula). The minimum of the garrison at Jerusalem, 1000 men, one cohort (σπεῖρα, τάξις, χιλίαρχος = tribunus), *B. J.* 2, 15, 6; 3, 4, 2; *Ant.* 20, 5, 3; Acts xxiii. 23; also cavalry, Acts, ib., *Ant.* 20, 8, 6. Paul had an escort of 470 men, Acts, ib. Reinforcements came from Samaria, *Ant.* 18, 3, 1, and Cæsarea, *B. J.* 2, 15, 3. Hence the number indefinite, *B. J.* 5, 5, 8; a τάγμα = legio (comp. *B. J.* 2, 18, 9, 12; 2, 19, 7), the ordinary garrison. At Cæsarea, lay Italian cohorts (Acts x. 1, xxvii. 1); in Cæsarea and Samaria together, five *cohortes*, two *alæ*, *Ant.* 19, 9, 2; *B. J.* 3, 4, 2.

way of the free activity of the scribes; and the shadow of an existence remained even of the judicial powers of the Jerusalem Sanhedrim, which met in the temple,—for the procurator sanctioned its sittings, and, after the time of Coponius, confirmed its sentences of death.[1] The fall of Pilate procured for the nation concessions such as they had not enjoyed even in the time of the Maccabees. The governor of Syria, Lucius Vitellius, the father of the future emperor, more estimable in Palestine than afterwards in Rome—whither he carried Eastern customs—not only lightened the taxes and gratified the people by the deposition first of Pilate (Passover, A.D. 36), and then of the high-priest Joseph Caiaphas; but he also delivered up the high-priest's garment, which the Maccabees, Herod, Archelaus, and the former Roman governors, had kept carefully shut up in the fort Antonia, producing it only for the feasts and the days of sacrifice. In the spring of A.D. 37, he refrained, at the request of the chief men of the Jews, from marching through the land with his troops and standards, although he was hastening to the aid of Antipas against the Arabs; he also went with Antipas to the feast, in order to sacrifice to God, in doing which he was scarcely following

Garrisons also in Ascalon, *B. J.* 3, 2, 1, and in the fortresses. In *the whole country about one legion* = 4000 to 10,000 men, comp. *Ant.* 17, 10, 1; *B. J.* 5, 5, 8; 7, 1, 2, probably a portion of the, at first—cir. A. U. C. 750—*three*, later—cir. A. U. C. 776, *i. e.* after the incorporation—*four Syrian legions*, *Ant.* 17, 10, 9; *B. J.* 2, 3, 1; Tac. *Ann.* 4, 23; *Hist.* 2, 4; Jos. *Ant.* 19, 9, 2; *B. J.* 2, 18, 9; 5, 1, 6. The nearest quarters of the 12th legion (Raphanea), *B. J.* 7, 1, 3; 7, 5, 1; comp. 2, 18, 9. See also Mommsen, l. c. p. 46. For the localities at Jerusalem, see below.

[1] Coponius comes with the *jus gladii*, *B. J.* 2, 8, 1. Comp. the trial of Jesus (John xviii. 31), and above, p. 246, note. Winer, II. p. 641. Grätz, III. p. 492. The relation of the *Romans* to the *Sanhedrim* will be seen from the following facts: (1) The Romans sanctioned a Sanhedrim. Acts xxiii. 15, 20; Jos. *Ant.* 20, 9, 1; and, indeed, they appealed to it, and received appeals from it, Acts xxii. 30, xxiii. 15. (2) The Romans reserved to themselves the right of confirming sentences of capital punishment, *B. J.* 2, 8, 1, comp. *Ant.* 20, 9, 1; John xviii. 31. (3) The Romans were not consulted, *Ant.* 20, 9, 1, so long at least as there was no question of capital punishment. Comp. Acts iv. 5. (4) From the time of the emperor Claudius (A.D. 41), first Agrippa I., then his brother Herod (from A.D. 46), afterwards Agrippa II., had the ἐπιμέλεια ἱεροῦ (*Ant.* 20, 1, 2; 20, 9, 7); and Agrippa II. called a Sanhedrim (20, 9, 6). But the question of competence remained a disputed point between him, the high-priest, and Rome (20, 9, 1).

Pilate's example.[1] Immediately after this (A.D. 38—40), the mad C. Caligula, who was on the throne of the Cæsars, began his attacks upon Judaism; but when these terrible years were past, the emperor Claudius repeatedly, in A.D. 41, 42, and A.D. 46, gave distinct expression to the principle of religious liberty, and placed religion and the temple rites under the control of the once more flourishing Jewish royal house: it even came to pass that Roman soldiers were executed for deriding the religion of the Jews.[2] All these concessions, however, and even the friendly disposition of many officers and soldiers towards the Jews, did not exclude abuse, or remove the feeling of insecurity and the anguish of oppression; and Claudius himself, after the decease of his friend, king Agrippa (A.D. 44), appointed procurators in the persons of Cumanus (A.D. 48), and especially of the cruel Claudius Felix (A.D. 52), who, supported by the all-powerful freedmen that were the emperor's advisers, and relying upon their soldiers and the fortifications of Herod, prepared the way for the desperate national resistance under Nero.[3]

While Judæa and Samaria long endured the trials of subjection to Rome, the rest of Palestine still remained under the sons of Herod. These were copies in miniature of their father, prevented from emulating his greatness both by the narrower limits of their territories and their lesser talents and feebler passions. The father's virtues and failings were singularly distributed: Archelaus represented the worst features of Herod, Philip his best, while Antipas stood between, the heir of what was little and base in the father's character.

From Augustus to Caligula, a period of forty-three years, Herod Antipas was tetrarch of those districts to which, when

[1] *Ant.* 18, 4, 3; 18, 5, 3. Comp. concerning him, Suet. *Vitell.*: Vir innocens et industrius, but devoted to women and to Caligula.

[2] *Ant.* 19, 5, 2, 3; 20, 1 sqq.; 20, 5, 3, 4. For Caligula, see below, the religious condition.

[3] Comp. only Jos. *Ant.* 20, 6, 3. Then, the trifling of the procurators themselves with the temple privileges of Agrippa II., 20, 9, 1. Even the temple moneys were not safe, 20, 9, 7; *B. J.* 2, 15, 6. Roman proselytes, Matt. viii. 5; Acts x. 1; comp. Tac. *Hist.* 3, 25; Suet. *Vit.* 2.

Herod's kingdom was divided, the second *rôle* seemed to have fallen; yet it pleased God that these lands, under this very prince, should have the spiritual lead in Israel,—that Galilee and Peræa should be the scenes of the work and teaching of the Baptist and of Jesus of Nazara.[1] The prince to whom these countries were subject, was insignificant in every respect. He was an imitator of his father, especially in three particulars—in amassing wealth, in servility, and in his love of building. He heaped up enormous treasures in the Holy Land, and had, moreover, great arsenals.[2] At the same time, he exerted himself, as zealously as his father had done, to obtain the emperor's favour, and he even went so far as to furnish Tiberius, who loved the slave and the informer, with servile reports.[3] His buildings were for the most part erected in homage of the emperor. In the fairest part of Galilee, at the upper end of the lake of Gennesareth, not far from the hot springs of Emmaus, there was dedicated to the emperor, in A.D. 22, the city of Tiberias, a city which had arisen where before there had been nothing but the reeds of the lake (the arms of the city), and on the site of a field of tombs which for a century had been an object of terror to the Jews (close to the ancient Rakkath). In order that it might be quickly peopled, he not only constrained many Galileans to settle there, but adventurers from all parts, particularly Greeks, poor people and slaves, were attracted thither by the assignment of houses, land, and various privileges; and that the city of the emperor might not be wanting in dignity, men of distinction made it their home. Antipas himself took up his residence there, built a strong fortress well furnished with military stores, and also a splendid palace adorned with figures of animals, decorated with gilded ceilings and candelabra of Corinthian brass. He gave to the city a beautiful market-place, and an amphitheatre—the remains of which are still

[1] Sometimes called by the name of the *pars potior*, merely Galilee, Jos. *Ant.* 18, 5, 4.

[2] *Ib.* 18, 6; *B. J.* 2, 9, 6.

[3] *Ant.* 18, 2, 3; 18, 4, 5.

visible,—and pronounced Tiberias to be the first city of Galilee, taking precedence even of Sepphoris. The peculiarities of its origin and architecture gave it a strong Gentile character, and made it a seat of Greek culture: hence it was an offence to the Jews, whose leaders in Jerusalem, shortly before the fall of the holy city, gave orders for the destruction of the palace of Antipas.[1] In Perœa also, Antipas did honour to the imperial house by the fortified city of Julias (Livias). Finally, he splendidly restored the old city of Sepphoris, in the midst of Galilee, which had been wholly destroyed in the war with Varus. From the circumstances of the case, Sepphoris became once more superior to Tiberias.[2]

There was little that was brilliant in the prince's personal qualities. He was sluggish and apathetic, timid and unenterprizing, both in peace and war, easily embarrassed and given to despondency; he was marked chiefly by that mean cunning of the fox which is ascribed to him in the Gospel.[3] His most decisive actions were performed at the instigation of his wife, contrary to his own inclination. In matters of religion, he was obtuse and without conviction, even without policy: in the founding of his cities, he unnecessarily irritated the Jews; and with reference to the procuratorship he did not possess himself of the national sympathy which, under Pilate, offered itself again, as an undeserved piece of good fortune, to the sons of Herod.[4] Nothing excited strong emotions in him except wealth—which he used ignobly in his relations to others—feasting, and women.[5] His passion for Herodias, his brother Herod's wife, whom he visited on a journey to Rome, caused him to overlook the fact that by marrying her he became a criminal towards his brother, a transgressor of the Law, an object of enmity to the Arab chiefs of his father-in-law, and finally the murderer of John the Baptist.

[1] *Ant.* 18, 2, 3; Jos. *Vita*, 9, 12, 13; *B. J.* 2, 21, 6. Comp. Sepp, *Jerusalem und das heilige Land*, II. p. 133. Rakkath, Joshua xix. 35.

[2] *Ant.* 18, 2, 1, 3; *B. J.* 2, 9, 1.

[3] *Ant.* 18, 7; Luke xiii. 32.

[4] Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* p. 1034.

[5] *Ant.* 18, 6, 2; 18, 7, 1.

In spite of everything, however, he must have been an endurable ruler, since his people bore with him for forty years. Josephus mentions no complaint, except that occasioned by the murder of the Baptist. The Galileans were undoubtedly less difficult to deal with in religious matters than the Jews; but they would have defended themselves against extortion. There was therefore some merit in that "love of rest" which was otherwise injurious to him.[1]

The star of the tetrarch Antipas set with that of his patron Tiberius. His good fortune was obscured some years before the emperor's death: a journey to Rome in A.D. 34 failed to procure him his brother Philip's inheritance, which soon after fell, as by a stroke of good luck at play, to his brother-in-law. A war with the Arab chief Aretas resulted from this journey,—a war which ended in an important reverse (A.D. 36). From this journey, also, resulted the murder of John the Baptist, a deed which displeased the tetrarch's own people, and disposed them to feel a malicious pleasure in his reverses. Finally, any effectual aid from Rome against the Arabians was prevented by the death of Tiberius, and by the disdain of the Roman governor, who withdrew into winter quarters at Petra.[2] But the worst consequences resulted from a second journey to Rome. After Herodias' brother Agrippa, son of the executed Aristobulus, and formerly spendthrift, beggar, robber-knight, and market-inspector at Tiberias, had, in the spring of A.D. 37, by the favour of his friend the new emperor Caligula, become tetrarch of Philip's district with the title of king; after Herodias had seen that brother, who was vain till his death, passing through the crowds, probably at the feast of Tabernacles at Jerusalem (in the autumn of A.D. 38), with the ostentation of a *parvenu* in royal robes, with his diadem and the golden chain that Caligula had hung round his neck, and with his escort of

[1] *Ant.* 18, 7, 2.

[2] *Ib.* 18, 5, 1—3. For further details see below, the history of the Baptist and the chronology of the first public appearance of Jesus.

guards, who had been recently acquired in Alexandria, and who were furnished with gilded armour and silver shields; after this time, Herodias gave her husband Antipas no peace, reviling him as a man without public spirit and incapable of great deeds, —because his natural disposition and his anxiety as to the state of his relations with Rome kept him in Palestine,—until, in the spring of A.D. 39, with truly royal pomp and with no stint of bars of gold and silver for bribery, he journeyed with her to Italy, in order to obtain from Caligula the title of King. But Agrippa had anticipated him, and had already accused his brother-in-law—with whom he had quarrelled at the very first —of conspiring with Sejanus and with the Parthians, and of having collected together arms enough for 70,000 men. The cause of Antipas was lost as soon as, at Baiæ, he honestly gave an affirmative answer to Caligula's plain question as to his store of arms; and he was from that hour condemned to perpetual banishment on account of his insatiable avarice. He was restricted to Lyons (the "Wars of the Jews" mentions Spain), and his only consolation was derived from the fact that Herodias shared his misfortunes until his death; perhaps also, if his rival brother Archelaus, who had been banished to Vienne, still lived, he might confer with him on the mutability of human things (A.D. 39).[1] The same Agrippa, whose vain display had, in one and the same year (A.D. 38), irritated the people of Alexandria to begin the persecutions of the Jews under Caligula, and

[1] *Ant.* 18, 7; *B. J.* 2, 9, 6. Whilst *Ant.* 18, 7, 2, places the deposition of Antipas in the second year of Caligula (A.D. 38, 39), *Ant.* 19, 8, 2, favours the fourth year (A.D. 40). But the year 39 must be accepted: (1) Agrippa came to Palestine as king, first in the summer of A.D. 38, *Ant.* 18, 6, 11, comp. Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* pp. 1017 sqq.; (2) Agrippa remained in Palestine, *Ant.* 18, 7, 2, whilst in A.D. 40 he was again in Rome, Philo, p. 1029, *Ant.* 18, 8, 7; (3) Caligula was in Baiæ and Puteoli before the German campaign (A.D. 40), *i.e.* in A.D. 39, Suet. *Calig.* 19; (4) the Alexandrian embassy journeyed to Rome in the winter of A.D. 38, 39, and was with the emperor at Puteoli, Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* pp. 1019, &c. The statement as to the fourth year is explained by the fact that Agrippa entered into possession of Galilee first in the year 40. Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* p. 1037, is also in favour of A.D. 39. The coins also (Eckhel, 1, 3, pp. 486 sqq.) show a forty-third year of Antipas. Ewald, again, VI. p. 295, fixes the deposition in A.D. 39.

aroused the deadly jealousy of his kindred, now came into possession of the territory of Antipas. And it was at the same time, and almost at the same place (at Puteoli and Baiæ), that Philo, at the head of the embassy of Alexandrian Jews, also suffered under the caprices of the Roman tyrant.

The picture which history has bequeathed of Philip, the son of Herod the Great by Cleopatra of Jerusalem, is more favourable: in his person, it is possible to become reconciled to the house of Herod. His dominion in the north-east of Palestine was the goal of the last wanderings of Jesus. One sign in his favour was the confidence reposed in him by Archelaus, who appointed him as administrator of his kingdom, and by the governor of Syria, Varus, who seconded his attempts to obtain the crown when the prospects of Archelaus had become gloomy. When he was appointed tetrarch, he devoted himself to his own land, which he never left; and he reigned prosperously for thirty-seven years, to the twentieth year of Tiberius. At the sources of the Jordan, in honour of the imperial house, and with the stereotyped nomenclature of flattery in use among these petty vassal princes, he founded the city of Cæsarea Philippi; and on the north of the lake of Gennesareth he transformed the village of Bethsaida into a large and flourishing town, Julias (after the daughter of Augustus), and there took up his residence. Thus he also was compelled to pay homage to the Romans; and in doing this he went so far as to impress the image of Augustus upon his coins—a proceeding from which Antipas and even Rome refrained. For the rest, he aimed at the well-being of his subjects, and avoided his father's too multifarious activity. He levied moderate taxes, was a just judge, and a friend to the poor and the persecuted. He travelled as unostentatiously and with as few followers as was consistent with the characteristic Eastern custom, which required the king to carry his royal state with him on a journey, and to administer justice on the highways. The country became prosperous, and even the rugged Trachonitis grew populous. Since he left no chil-

dren from his marriage with Salome, the daughter of Herodias, Tiberius, after Philip's death (A.D. 33, 34), passing over even his friend Agrippa, annexed the tetrarchy to Syria.[1]

The subsequent history of these countries belongs to the apostolic age. We must state that the sun of good fortune once more unexpectedly rose upon the Holy Land in the person of the Herodian Agrippa, the offspring of Herod the Great's executed son Aristobulus, and the treacherous brother-in-law of Antipas: this Agrippa ruled, under the name of king, over the tetrarchy of Philip from the year A.D. 37, and over that of Antipas from A.D. 39, 40; finally, in A.D. 41, he was put in possession by the emperor Claudius of the whole of the territory that had belonged to his grandfather, and, in the noblest sense of the word, he proved himself an Asmonæan Herodian, a protector of his people. But we must add that the dream was short: the popular king died at Cæsarea in A.D. 44, in the fifty-fourth year of his age, and nearly all his possessions fell to Rome. His son, Agrippa II., who was seventeen years old at his father's death, gradually obtained, under Claudius (in A.D. 48 and 53) and Nero (A.D. 54), a very modest kingdom, including the tetrarchy of Philip and only fragments of Galilee. From A.D. 44, the Romans alone ruled in Jerusalem, although between A.D. 46 and 48, Herod, the brother of Agrippa I., and afterwards Agrippa II., were permitted to have control over the temple rites. The latter, like all his house, was too favourable to the Gentiles, and not always mindful of the peculiarities of his own nation; in alliance with the Romans, he survived the last desperate struggle of the Jews, and, when an old man under Trajan, saw Jerusalem in ruins.[2]

[1] *B. J.* 2, 9, 1, 6; *Ant.* 18, 4, 6. Trachonitis, 17, 2, 2. Marriage, 18, 5, 4. For the coins, comp. Ewald, *Gesch. Israels*, V. p. 46, note 2 (1st ed.). Rome, see Renan, *Les Apôtres*, 1866, p. 144. Cæsarea, comp. Suet. *Oct.* 60 : Reges amici atque socii, et singuli in suo quisque regno, *Cæsareas urbes* condiderunt. The temples of Augustus and of Rome, after A.U.C. 725, Suet. *Oct.* 52. Tac. *Ann.* 1, 10; 4, 37. Dio, 51, 20. Mommsen, VI.

[2] Comp. p. 254, note. He betrayed his latest sentiments in Berytus, which he filled with *heathen images*, *Ant.* 20, 9, 4. Similarly his father, comp. 19, 9, 1.

Second Division.—THE RELIGIOUS GROUND-WORK.

Amid the storms of time, and while suffering the unsought embraces of the great nations that for centuries had been contending for the possession of the Holy Land, the people of God were exposed to other losses than such as were merely political: the nation was in danger of losing its individuality, its spiritual existence. Are we to ascribe instability to the Divine purposes, when a nation for which the finger of God seemed to have fashioned this corner of the Mediterranean, bulwarked with sea, mountains and deserts, becomes, after a certain point in its history, more than any other, the football and object of barter among conquerors? Or does the eye discern, though from afar, the ways of the Divine Wisdom which willed that the acquisitions won in this quiet working-place of the Spirit should flow forth into His wide and thus newly-enriched world—nay, which would nerve the profound mind that dwelt there not only to the most enduring steadfastness by the fiery trial of unparalleled earthly suffering, but also to the consummate daring of an ideal contempt for, and an ideal conquest of, the world, by victorious heavenward-struggling thought?

First Section.—The Jewish Illumination. Philo the Alexandrian.

Though Israel did not remain altogether uninjured in character and peculiarities by this enforced intercourse with the Gentile world, it played the part of teacher more prominently than that of learner. Exile had both strengthened the old belief, and supplemented it with Eastern, especially Persian, religious elements, with the doctrine of a kingdom of good and evil spirits. After the time of Alexander the Great—who in person at Jerusalem so

magnanimously relieved the high-priest Jaddua and the people from their anxieties—Greek culture, attractive by contrast and superior in science, art and social customs, had flowed in with stronger and more irresistible force. Under the Macedonian, Sichem already stood forth with its temple of Gerizim, as a sanctuary for all the law-despisers of Jerusalem; and under his successors, Greek education, science, art, religion, and licentiousness, began to press in from Egypt and Syria. From the middle of the third century before Christ, Philhellenism had crept in through some of the oldest high-priestly families—as, in particular, through Joseph, son of Tobias, and farmer of taxes and governor of the people (under Ptolemy Euergetes, who died B.C. 222), and through Joseph's son Hyrcanus, a family connected with David. From the same circles—*e. g.* Jason the high-priest and Alcimus—under Antiochus Epiphanes, came the open assertion of heathenism, which tempted the Syrian king to improve (as Tacitus expresses it) the Jewish customs, to abolish the old religion, to act violently towards the adherents of that religion, and to dedicate the temple at Jerusalem to the Olympic Zeus (B.C. 168).[1] The war of liberation waged by the priest Mattathias and his "zealots" (Chasidim) against the "lawless" (from B.C. 167), was an act of the most thorough emancipation in the interests of pure religion; but very soon—and especially from the time of Aristobulus I., who bore the title of "Philhellene," and caused Greek coins to be struck—friendship with the Greeks revived even in the princely family that had fought in the war of liberation. Alexander Jannæus (B.C. 105—79), surrounded by foreigners and mistresses, systematically abused the national party; and after the short interval that was favourable

[1] Alexander the Great, *Ant.* 11, 8. Joseph, Hyrcanus (related to the high-priest Onias), 12, 4. Connection with David, according to *Breviar. Phil.* in Herzfeld, I. p. 379. State of things in the time of Antiochus, 1 Macc. i. 11 sqq.; *Ant.* 12, 5. Tac. *Histor.* 5, 8. Comp. Ewald, IV. pp. 372 sq. Jost, I. pp. 346 sqq. Grätz, III. pp. 26 sqq. Herzfeld, II. pp. 186 sqq. Oehler, article *Volk Gottes.* Also Grossmann, *De Philosophia Sadducæorum, Programm* IV. (1838). Also below, Pharisaism and Sadduceism.

to the national party, under Alexandra and Hyrcanus, began the long era of Herod, the flatterer of foreigners.[1]

The adoption of what was foreign obtained much more extensively among the Jews who were abroad, than in the Jewish fatherland. The numberless Jews who, like the sun in his course, filled both east and west, cast among the nations in some cases by national misfortune, and in other cases by the eager spirit of enterprize, — those thousands in Syria, Asia Minor, Egypt, Greece and Rome, adopted, as we can easily understand, not only the language but in part also the customs of the foreign lands.[2] They readily assumed Greek and Roman names, as we see, for example, in the names of the Alexandrian elders; they followed every occupation—agriculture, merchandise, commerce, and navigation, and sometimes the profanest occupations, as play-acting, soothsaying, and the keeping of brothels. They artfully concealed their circumcision and intermarried with Gentiles. They frequented—as did even the pious Alexandrian, Philo—the heathen theatre and gladiatorial combats. Philo incessantly deplores their falling away from the customs of their fathers, their volatilization of literal commands into mere ideas, their indifference to divine worship, and complains even of the existence of inexorable scoffers at the sacred history; and he lived to witness, in his own family, the going over to heathenism of his nephew, Tiberius Alexander, afterwards procurator of Judæa under Claudius Cæsar.[3] Nevertheless, by the side of all this

[1] Aristobulus, *Ant.* 13, 11, 3. Jannæus, 13, 13, 5; 13, 14, 2; *B. J.* 1, 5, 1. ἑλληνικὴ πολιτεία, *Ant.* 12, 5, 1. ἄνομοι, 1 Macc. ii. 44. ἐπιμιξία, 2 Macc. xiv. 3. Comp. Grätz, III. pp. 99 sqq. Oehler, l. c. pp. 283 sqq.

[2] The diffusion of Judaism, Jos. *Con. Ap.* 2, 39; *B. J.* 2, 18; 7, 3, 3. Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* pp. 1031, 1023; *in Flacc.* p. 971. Seneca ap. Aug. *Civ. D.* 6, 11.

[3] I would remind the reader only of the Jewish actor Aliturus, under Nero (Jos. *Vita*, 3); of Poppæa; of the Roman satirists' descriptions of the Jewish soothsayers who invoked Jupiter, and in their magic formulæ mentioned the heathen gods together with Solomon and Moses. As to the keepers of brothels, &c., comp. Juven. 8, 159 sq.; Pliny, *H. nat.* 30, 2. Mixed marriages mentioned in the N. T., comp. 1 Cor. vii. 1 sqq.; Acts xvi. 1, xxiv. 24. Philo in the theatre, see his work, *Quod annis prob. liber.*, Frankfort ed. 1691, pp. 869, 886. ἦφη πάτρια κινοῦσι, Philo, *De vit. Mos.*

yielding to modern and Hellenic thought, there ever survived a consciousness of peculiarity, an attachment to the Law—of which Philo so often boasts—pride in an ancient sacred history, even in the name of Jew, and a glowing and remarkably successful zeal for the conversion of the Gentiles. From west and east, from Rome and Babylon, even from Egypt, where, since the time of Antiochus (cir. B.C. 160), a special temple had been built in Leontopolis, the sons of the dispersion, together with their converts, flocked to the feasts in the city of the great King; and the embassies to the feasts deposited treasures of sacred tribute in the temple which was dearer to the Jews than all else. Envious heathenism gave expression to its annoyance at the accumulation of these treasures, by the mouth of Cicero; and a little later, in the person of Crassus and others, laid a plundering hand upon them, but without exhausting them.[1] The completest amalgamation with Hellenism occurred in Egypt, where, favoured by the Ptolemies, there lived a million Jews; and of the five districts of Alexandria with its 300,000 free inhabitants (Diodorus), more than two were peopled by Jews.[2] But here they fulfilled a higher mission than that of merely transporting Roman corn across the Mediterranean: they undertook to mediate between the spiritual culture of the East and that of the West. They engaged in this work in an independent and dignified manner, without national self-assertion, and without sacrificing their nationality to foreign influences: they enriched Judaism with the thought and art of Greece; whilst, on the other hand,

I. p. 607. Scoffers, ib., *De nom. mut.* p. 1053. Herzfeld, p. 515. Tib. Alexander, *Ant.* 20, 5, 2.

[1] Comp. Philo, *in Flacc.*, see p. 280, note 1. Self-consciousness, Rom. ii. 17; Rev. ii. 9, iii. 9. Proselytes, Jos. *Con. Ap.* 2, 39. Horace, Sat. 1, 9, 70 sq. Tac. *Hist.* 5, 6. Treasures, Cic. *Pro Flacc.* 28. Embassies bringing sacred tribute, Jos. *Ant.* 18, 9, 1. Μητρόπολις, ἱερόπολις, Philo, *Leg.* p. 1031; Matt. v. 35; Rev. xx. 9. Temple treasure, comp. Crassus, Gabinus, Pilate, Agrippa II., and Florus. Comp. Grätz, pp. 122 sqq.

[2] Dispersion in Egypt, Philo, *in Flacc.* p. 971. Jewish quarters, *ib.* 973. Occupations: peasants, merchants, sailors, artizans, *ib.* 974. The elders, *ib.* 976. As to Alexandria, see also *B. J.* 2, 16, 4. Comp.—besides Ewald and Oehler—Jost, I. pp. 351 sqq.; Grätz, III. pp. 26 sqq.; Herzfeld, III. pp. 436 sqq.

they gave to heathenism the imperishable essence of Mosaism, purer conceptions, purer and humane manners, in an enlightened Greek form.[1] Jewish philosophers—of whom the first we can distinguish is Aristobulus the Aristotelian (B.C. 160), reputed to have been a Galilean by birth—Jewish poets and historians, made their appearance, and skilfully converted Moses into a Greek philosopher, and the philosophers into the patrons and clients of Hebrew wisdom. The sacredly revered central point of the whole of the new literature was formed by the translation of the Old Testament into Greek, and, by the influence of the philosophers, even into a Greek form of thought. The most complete compendium of the Neo-jewish views, as represented in a tolerably harmonious manner by the Septuagint translation (B.C. 250—150), by Aristobulus, by the Jewish Sibylline poets, by the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach (cir. B.C. 130), and by the probably much later and truly Philonic book of the Wisdom of Solomon, is found in *Philo* of Alexandria, the contemporary of Jesus. A history of Jesus cannot pass over the man who, on account of the age in which he lived, and the great similarity and contrasts between him and Jesus, challenges comparison with the latter, even though it can be shown that the course of life of Jesus did not in any way come into contact with that of Philo.[2]

[1] The subjection to the Law, even on the part of Egyptian Jews, is shown by Philo: simplicity of life, also of diet, *in Flacc.* p. 979; virtue and seclusion of women and virgins, *ib.* p. 977; triumphant martyrdom, *ib.*; although there were not wanting those who fell away, *ib.* p. 979. As things that attracted the Gentiles, Josephus (*Con. Ap.* 2, 39) mentions unitedness, benevolence, diligence, and heroism in suffering for the Law.

[2] Concerning the Alexandrian Jews, especially Aristobulus and the Septuagint, comp. Eus. 7, 32; *Præp. ev.* 9, 6; 13, 12. Clem. *Strom.* 1, 15, 22; 5, 11. Valckenær, *Diatribe de Aristobulo Judæo*, 1806. Ewald, IV. pp. 308 sqq. Oehler, l. c. Fritzsche, *Bibel* (Herzog). Herzfeld, III. pp. 473 sqq., 564 sqq. Frankel, *Ueber die palästinische und alexandrinische Schriftforschung, Progr.* 1854. Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums*, I. pp. 367 sqq. Grätz, III. 26 sqq. Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, 1st ed. III. 2, pp. 559 sqq. A whole literature is devoted to Philo the Alexandrian: comp. Grossmann, *Quæstiones philonianæ*, 1829. As also Schäffer, 1829. Gfrörer, *Gesch. des Urchristenthums*, 1831. Dähne, *Jüdisch-alexandrinische Religions-philosophie*, 1834. Zeller, l. c. 1852, III. 2, pp. 594 sqq. Riehm, *Hebräerbrief*, pp. 249

Philo (to whom the later Jews have given the Hebrew name Jedidiah) may have been born about twenty years before Christ, since, on the occasion of his embassy to the emperor Caligula in A.D. 39, he describes himself as an elderly man.[1] He was brother to Alexander, a man who both by his family and wealth was the leading member of the Alexandrian community and president of the Jews (Alabarch); and was himself (according to Josephus) so renowned, that he held the first place in an important deputation of three to Caligula, in the interests of his oppressed co-religionists. He—as well as Alexander—was on intimate terms with the Jewish royal house (a sign of liberal views); and, together with king Agrippa, to whom his brother was banker, friend, and ultimately also kinsman, he continued to be the unwearied protector of the rights of the nation, especially under Caligula. Notwithstanding the existence of a temple in Egypt, his family was so faithful to the temple in Jerusalem that the gold and silver plating of nine of the temple doors proclaimed the splendid beneficence of Alexander. The nobility of his race and his profound erudition—of which Josephus also speaks—were crowned by the elevation and stainlessness of a natural character which, nurtured from his youth up in philosophical ideals, resisted the fascinations of sensuality, riches, and honour, and gave to his like-minded wife, when speaking of women's love of fine dress, the proud sentiment, that the hus-

sqq. J. G. Müller, *Philo*, in Herzog. I. pp. 235 sqq.; XI. pp. 578 sqq. Most recently, Ewald, VI. pp. 233 sqq. Langen, pp. 264 sqq. The Book of Wisdom ascribed to Philo as early as Jerome's time, *Præf. in libr. Sal.* According to Grimm, as old as B.C. 145. Ewald (IV. pp. 626 sqq.) recognizes its close resemblance to Philo.

[1] δι' ἡλικίαν καὶ παιδείαν, Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* p. 1018. The year 39 (the journey in the winter, *i.e.* in the beginning of 39) can be fixed with exactness from this work and from Josephus (comp. Philo, pp. 1017 sqq.; Jos. *Ant.* 18, 6, 11). Also Flaccus, the governor of Egypt, appears to have been deposed in the autumn of 38; and the journey followed upon that deposal; comp. *in Flacc.* pp. 982 sq. Ewald, VI. pp. 310 sq., fixes the journey in A.D. 39, 40. Jost, I. p. 381, very inaccurately fixes his birth at about the time of Herod's death. Ewald, VI. p. 311, sets it at B.C. 10—20; ib. p. 239, he says that in A.D. 40, Philo was about 60—70 years old.

band's virtue was the wife's adornment.[1] He lived down to the times of the emperor Claudius (his brother must have died before A.D. 46); and an ancient Christian tradition, mentioned by Eusebius, brings the greatest representative of progressive Judaism into relations with Peter at Rome, similar to those which are said to have existed between Paul and Seneca.[2]

Philo does not claim to be an original thinker, or the interpreter of a new view of the world which should overcome the opposite opinions of the day, or to be the organ of a new divine revelation. Now and then he may boast of being the interpreter of the divine mysteries to those who do not understand them, or, in the warm sunshine of the ideas which dawn upon him, he may praise the God who has risen upon his soul; but generally he is conscious of proclaiming old truths which he has learnt either from Moses, or from the teachers of the Law, or from the Alexandrian philosophers, or from the holy men settled in the desert, or from Plato, Pythagoras, and the rest. In accordance with the spirit of the age, he is dependent upon the thoughts of others, a man of fusion and reconciliation; but he boldly grasps the most difficult mediatorial *rôle* which the world could offer. If he does not solve his problem, it is because it cannot be solved without a higher truth than either Judaism or heathenism possessed. He brings to his task an amount of ability and learning, of acuteness and range of thought and language, which saves him from the reproach of absurdity, and which has secured to his aspiring mind the glory of having struck the highest points

[1] Jos. *Ant.* 18, 8, 1; 20, 5, 2; *B. J.* 5, 5, 3; comp. Ewald, p. 233. Grätz, pp. 265 sqq. Connection with the Herodians, Philo, *Leg.* pp. 1017 sq., 1033 sq.; *in Flacc.* pp. 669 sqq. Afterwards, even relationship, Jos. *Ant.* 19, 5, 1; 20, 7, 3. Ewald, VI. p. 235, attempts to show, from the treatises published by Aucher, that Alex. was Philo's nephew. On the contrary, I am led to doubt this by *Ant.* 18, 8, 1, and especially by 20, 5, 2, where the death of the supposed nephew, more correctly brother, is already—in A.D. 46—assumed. Josephus would have been acquainted with these relationships. Tiberius Alexander, the nephew and procurator, he calls simply Alexander, *Ant.* 20, 5, 2.

[2] The *Leg. ad Caj.* &c. was written under Claudius. The tradition, Eus. 2, 17.

of agreement between Hebraism and philosophy, and even the supreme glory of approaching, of possessing affinity with, the greater Master who followed him.

Philo was not one of the many precipitate Jewish reformers of his time, who were ready to barter cheaply their Jewish inheritance for the advantages of a new illumination. The national philosophy is his firm standpoint. Abraham, the Chaldæan and father of the race, is to him the forerunner of all God-believing and God-filled men; Moses, the father of the Law, the theologian, and yet more especially the proto-prophet, nay, the prophet, lawgiver, priest, and king in one, is to him the greatest of all men, the man who was honoured with the abiding indwelling of the Spirit of God, and who rose to the highest heights of wisdom.[1] The other holy men of the past were, in relation to him, only disciples and friends; and the greatest men among the Greeks, Heraclitus, Hesiod, Plato, Zeno, even the Greek lawgivers, of themselves only dimly perceiving the nature of God and of the world and the true law, learnt more clearly from him. Greek science in general bore the same relation to the divine wisdom as Hagar the stranger to Sarah the princess.[2] Hence Philo himself made it the chief business of his life to interpret the deep meanings of the Law of Moses, which was important in every letter; and though much may at present appear to us as ingenious trifling, yet he has beautifully given prominence to, and has finely and edifyingly expounded, the kernel of the Law, the ten commandments, the one God and His providence, the spiritual and moral worship of God, the friendliness towards man of all God's commands, which do not threaten, but are serviceable to man and are easy to keep.[3] The Jewish nation itself is the first-

[1] Comp. concerning Abraham, the fine passage in *De nobil.* p. 908. Moses *ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα μέγιστος καὶ τελειότατος*, *Vit. Mos.* I. p. 602. His four offices, *De præm.* p. 918; *ἐπ' αὐτὴν φθάσας τὴν ἀκρότητα σοφίας*, *Mundi opif.* p. 2.

[2] *De congressu quær. erud. grat.* p. 427: *σάῤῥα γυνή, παλλακὴ δὲ Ἀγὰρ ἡ ἐγκύκλιος μουσικὴ πᾶσα.*

[3] Importance of every letter, *De profug.* p. 458. *φιλανθρωπία*, *De charit.* p. 697. *κύριος ἀγαθὸς, οὐκ ἀπειλῶν*, *De decalog*, pp. 768 sq. *οὐ χαλεπὸν*, *De victim.* p. 853; *De præm.* p. 922.

born of the Creator, his peculiar, eternal possession, the priest and God-seeing prophet for the other nations, the leadership of which belongs to it, and out of compulsory subjection to which, even out of the hands of a Caligula, it will rise again, though the very temple, the holiest thing of all, seem to be lost.[1] The nation has indeed itself apostatized, and bears the penalty of its apostasy; but, a bereaved orphan in the world, it is not forsaken of God: its symbol is the blossoming almond-rod of Aaron, and its conversion will bring to it and to the world the age of the Messiah.

Hand in hand with this theocratical Jewish standpoint, goes an extensive adoption of Gentile culture. In this manner, Judaism itself is consciously, and yet more unconsciously, transformed, spiritualized, and dissipated. All the wise men of the world are favourites of Philo's, from the Gymnosophists of India and the Magi of Persia to the philosophers of Greece, that "cradle" of all culture—Pythagoras, Heraclitus, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Cleanthes. The historians and the tragedians also spring up in his memory. The wise men of Greece are to him virtuous, holy, godly men. To him, as to the Stoics and to Moses, ethics is the highest branch of philosophy, for the final problem of wisdom is purity of life. Even the mythology of the poets he explains by means of allegory. In this way he is able to find truth in the Gentile religion itself—a thing almost impossible to the Jew. Much as he abhors heathenism, which sets the creature in the place of the Creator, yet since its objects of worship, and especially the stars, those visible gods, in some sort represent the Godhead, he forbids the cursing of those objects of worship, as desecrating the name of God himself; and he believes in the divine punishment of a robbery of the temple at Delphi.[2] Under such circumstances, Greek ideas necessarily entered

[1] Comp. *Leg. ad Caj.* pp. 992, 1019 sq.

[2] Zeller, pp. 596 sqq. The heathen: *τινὲς τὸν κόσμον μᾶλλον ἢ τὸν κοσμοποιὸν θαυμάσαντες, De opif. mund.* p. 2. *τὸν δ' ἀνωτάτω καὶ πρεσβύτατον γεννητὴν—παρεκαλύψαντο, De decal.* p. 751.

deeply into his own theology. Plato's doctrine of ideas, the Stoic doctrine of virtue, so often flow from his pen, that the ancients said: "Either Philo platonized, or Plato philonized."[1] The means of infusing Greek thought into Jewish, however, was that all-embracing allegory which Plato and the Stoics had already applied to the interpretation of the Greek myths, and which Aristobulus had naturalized in Alexandria, long before Philo. The Scripture is full of the allegory of the letter which —the letter—after the manner of a body, contains within itself the "soul." Not merely the Law, with its thousand sensual trivialities, but even the history of the patriarchs, disappears in allegory, and Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are simply representatives of the virtues! Thus, much of the Scripture, when taken literally, would be mythical, absurd, foolish, a mere profanity: who can suppose that God required six days to make the world, or that in a material form he talked with Abraham or Moses, in a thorn-bush or on Sinai? These material representations are only acts of condescension on the part of God to the weakness of the multitude, who could not otherwise understand him. As God himself once said to Moses: Tell them I am the Existing One, who has no other name but that of Existence; but if, in the weakness of their nature, they ask for a specific name, then call me the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,—the three patterns of virtue.[2] Philo is altogether unaware that he is thus introducing into the Old Testament anything different from, or newer and higher than, what is already there: in his opinion, the higher meaning is God's original meaning, and he thanks God for calling him to be the interpreter of His thoughts. In a certain sense, also, God insists upon both letter and spirit: He

[1] Jerome, *Cat.* 11, and *Ep. ad Magn.* 83. Clem. *Strom.* 1, 15, 72, calls him a Pythagorean.

[2] *Vit. Mos.* I. p. 614; *Leg. alleg.* I. p. 41: *εὔηθες πάνυ τὸ οἴεσθαι, ἐξ ἡμέραις ἢ καθόλου χρόνῳ κόσμον γεγονέναι. Decal.* p. 748 (has God spoken?): *ἄπαγε, μητ' εἰς νοῦν ποτ' ἐλθῃ τὸν ἡμέτερον. οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὁ Θεὸς, στόματος καὶ γλώσσης καὶ ἀρτηρίων δεόμενος.* See also Zeller, p. 601.

allows no one to break the outward Sabbath, or neglect the feast-days, or circumcision, under pretence of a spiritual interpretation. Who dares separate himself as a recluse from the community, and provoke its reproach? or set aside the ordinances of greater men? or impiously destroy the body, the organ of the soul, whilst the cherishing of the body—the Law—first reveals the spiritual meaning of that Law?

The Philonic theology is materially the result of a peculiar combination of the Jewish and of the Platonic and Neo-platonic conceptions of God. The God of the Old Testament, as the God "of sublimity" (*der Gott "der Erhabenheit"*)—as modern philosophy, in the person of Hegel, called Him—possessed a kind of elective affinity with the conception of God of that Greek philosophy which believed the Supreme Being could be correctly defined by the negation of everything that was finite. Accordingly, Philo described God as the simply Existent, and denied Him every attribute, every name, even such as the Good, the Beautiful, the Blessed, the One, since He is better than goodness, higher than unity, can never be known in his *How*, but only in his *That*,—his whole name is the four mysterious letters (Jhvh), is pure Being.[1]

By such means, indeed, neither a fuller theology, nor even a passing over of God into the world, was to be obtained. And yet it was the problem of philosophy as well as of religion to explain the world out of God, and on the other hand to lead it to God. But how could the world be derived from this Being which ever withdrew from contact with the world? Neither Philo, nor the philosophy of the time, could solve the problem except at the expense of logic. Still, the "sublimity" was not sacrificed. The Divine essence, unrecognizable by the world, recognizable only by itself, contains within itself the fullness of all real things, is the prototype of all perfection, is ever active, ever creating. If it does not *essentially* pass over into the world,

[1] *De præm. et poen.* p. 916. Zeller, pp. 603 sqq.

it does so *operatively* by its powers, its angels, its supreme goodness and omnipotence, its hierarchy of archangels; the instrument, interpreter, representative, and messenger of God, the image, the firstborn, the Son of God, the second God who is himself God, the divine Word, the Logos, communicates with the world; he is the idea, the prototype of the world and of man, the architect and upholder of the world; he is the manna and the rock in the desert. He creates the world, not in time, but with time; and he does not, strictly speaking, create it, but he forms it, by impressing himself, the intelligent world, like a signet-ring, upon the independent matter, the void, the dark, the formless, the non-existent, the chaotic, the discordant, the ground of all the imperfection and evil in the world.[1]

The world, so far as it is of God, is a well-ordered city, containing nothing but what is good, because nothing but what is good comes from God (the name of goodness), and because God's goodness is the cause of his creating.[2] Man is the crown and end of the earthly world, a world in little, a heaven in little, a copy of the Logos, an ethereal streaming-forth and radiation of the Godhead, the God-allied being, the image of God, the worthiest temple of God—not indeed in body, but in spirit—the offshoot, the son of God, as far as human nature is capable of the divine. Angels ascend and descend, to carry commands and prayers between the Father and his children. The slaying of a man, the most sacred creature, is sacrilege. The dignity of man is here asserted in two languages—that of the Old Testament and that of philosophy.[3]

[1] λόγος and κόσμος νοητὸς, *Mund. opif.* pp. 4 sqq.; comp. the excellent account by Zeller, pp. 608 sqq. Riehm, *Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefs*, pp. 411 sqq. The exclusion of time from the act of creation especially clear in *De mund. opif.* p. 3 : ἐν ἀρχῇ = οὐ κατὰ χρόνον, χρόνος γὰρ οὐκ ἦν πρὸ κόσμου ἀλλ' ἢ σὺν αὐτῷ ἢ μετ' αὐτόν.

[2] Θεὸς ὄνομα χαριστικῆς δυνάμεως, *Somn.* p. 589. ὁ ἀγαθότατος, *Leg. all.* p. 74.

[3] συγγένεια πατρὸς, *Mund. opif.* p. 33. λόγου, *De execrat.* p. 936. ἐμφερέστερον οὐδὲν γηγενὲς ἀνθρώπου θεῷ, *Mund. opif.* p. 15. εἰκὼν κατὰ τον νοῦν *ib.* οἰκειότατον καὶ φίλτατον ζῶων, *ib.* p. 17. ἀπόσπασμα, ἀπαύγασμα, p. 33. ἱεροσυλία,

Yet man is fallen. Philo has two accounts of this fact—one mythological, and the other philosophical, yet based upon the Old Testament itself. According to the one, man lived in the ideal world, related to the angels and equal to them. But the human souls, standing lower in the terrestrial atmosphere, were seized with a longing for what was material, sank to earth, assumed mortal bodies; and only a few succeed in recovering their lost position, by means of philosophy. According to the other account, God created two kinds of men,—the ideal man after the image of God, purely spiritual, incorporeal, sexless, and immortal; and the earthly man, a creature, not begotten, material, earthly, although possessing also a divine spirit, male and female, and mortal. Placed on the borders of mortal and immortal nature, glorious in body and soul, and capable of rising to the immortal, man, the first father of the human race, exposed as a creature to the danger of sinking into what was evil, laid his hands on material lust, i. e. the woman, chose what was hateful and a lie; and as the servant of sensuality and of unrighteousness, introduced to humanity an unhappy and degenerate life. Heathenism, also participating—according to the Jewish sibyl—in the one spirit of God, chose the creature instead of the Creator; Israel remained faithful to God, but even its forefathers had heaped up sin, and only the noblest—Moses and the holy men—had subdued the wild horse of sensual lust from their youth up: the multitude served evil lust, the source whence all evil flowed, the flame that consumed the wood, the habit which, established in childhood, is stronger than nature, and imparts its evil savour to the vessel for ever. No one is without sin; even he who is perfect, if he is one who was born, does not escape sin. According to Job, no one lives a day without sin. Mortal nature ever preserves its stains; the perfect possession of the virtues is impossible to our nature. Man bears,

De decal. p. 763. Often the limitation: ὅσον ἠδύνατο δέξασθαι θνητὴ φύσις, *De nobil.* p. 906; *Præm.* p. 916. Nothing but good from God, *Decal.* p. 768. Angels, *Somn.* p. 586.

even when no one accuses, the fire of an evil conscience in himself, the sole tribunal which cannot be swayed by eloquence; he is inwardly unhappy, dead even while living, ever in process of dying and in Hades; and actual death scarcely brings with it the beginning of punishment.[1]

Yet there is salvation to be had; God himself wills it, and it is brought to pass by the act of the wise man. Adam's successors still preserve the types of relationship with the Father, though in an obscure form; each man has the knowledge of good and evil, and an incorruptible, reason-obeying judgment, and is, in his spiritual nature, still allied with the divine Logos, is still an impression, epitome, reflection of the holy nature.[2] It is necessary only that man should recognize, with understanding and eye, all the stains with which he has voluntarily or involuntarily defiled his life; that, in accordance with this self-knowledge, he should determine to rise above his passions, to despise his pleasures and lusts, to undergo the struggles of repentance and the toilsome efforts of righteousness, and in piety and justice—those fundamental human virtues—to become an imitator of the virtues of the Father.[3] Among these virtues are to be numbered truthfulness—without an oath when possible—and that love of

[1] Fall from the higher world, *Somn.* p. 586; *Gigant.* p. 285. The two classes of men (the higher according to Gen. i. 26 sq., the lower according to Gen. ii. 7), *Mund. opif.* p. 30; *Leg. alleg.* I. pp. 46, 57. Comp. my *Gesch. Chr.* p. 141. Zeller, p. 638. Fall of Adam, *Mund. opif.* pp. 34 sqq.; *De nobil.* p. 906. *οὐδὲν τῶν ἐν γενέσει βέβαιον*, *Mund. opif.* p. 34. *κακοδαίμων βίος*, *ib.* p. 35. The heathen, *ib.* p. 2; *Decal.* p. 751. The Jews, *Nobil.* p. 906. Moses, *Vit. Mos.* I. p. 606. Evil desire, *Decal.* pp. 763 sq. None without sin, *De victim.* p. 846; *Nom. mutat.* pp. 1051 sqq. Evil conscience, *De nobil.* p. 906; *Decal.* 751. Living in death: *ἄθλιοι τὰς ψυχὰς τεθνᾶσι*, *De vict.* p. 860. *θάνατος μόγις ἀρχὴ ἐν τῷ θείῳ δικαστηρίῳ*, *Præm.* p. 921.

[2] *Mund. opif.* p. 33: *τοὺς ἀπογόνους τῆς ἐκείνων μετέχοντας ἰδέας ἀναγκαῖον εἰ καὶ ἀμυδροὺς, ἀλλ' οὖν ἔτι σώζειν τοὺς τύπους τῆς πρὸς τὸν πατέρα συγγενείας. ἡ δὲ συγγένειτ τίς; πᾶς ἄνθρωπος κατὰ μὲν τὴν διάνοιαν ᾠκείωται θείῳ λόγῳ, τῆς μακαρίας φύσεως ἐκμαγεῖον ἢ ἀποσπασμα ἢ ἀπαύγασμα γεγονώς.* Good and evil, *Q. Deus s. immut.* p. 301.

[3] Self-knowledge, *De vict.* p. 848. Decision, *De præm.* p. 912. *μετανοίας ἀγῶνες, δικαιοσύνη, πόνοι ἄτρυτοι καὶ ἀκαμπεῖς*, by means of which *περιποίησις τοῦ καλοῦ*, p. 914. *ἐπακολουθήσας ταῖς τοῦ γεννήσαντος ἀρεταῖς*, *De nobil.* p. 906.

man which lends and gives, treats man as a holy thing, and makes man what he was destined to be, the gentle, peaceful, social citizen of the world.[1] The reform of morals, however, the purification of the soul, consists mainly in separation from *matter*, from flesh and lust. He who has arrived at the right decision adopts the best course when he forsakes home, kindred, friends, and fatherland, and retires into solitude; he withdraws himself from public business and its pressure, tumult, and distraction; he renounces—as did Moses from the time he became a prophet—the pleasures of marriage, since only the unwise man entangles himself with sensual things; like the pious hermits, he inures himself to continence, and thus is converted into an immaterial spirit. Yet higher than ascetic wisdom is the theoretic, which consists in thirsting after the waters of wisdom, in seeking heavenly riches, and in ardently aspiring to gaze upon the beauty of the imperishable, of that which is above, of the world of ideas, even of the great King, the Father of all. Seized with Corybantic phrensy, the aspirant hastens to that Father of all, presses beyond the limits of human nature, and, dazzled yet blessed, becomes sensible of the influx of divine light; that which is mortal disappears, while that which is imperishable rises; in a state of stupor, concentration, insensibility, simplification, trance, he loses the whole of his material nature, lives, in the fellowship of the Divine Spirit by which the soul is involuntarily moved like the strings of an instrument, a blessed, unending, divine life, in faith, joy, and contemplation; and, while the sensual pass into new bodies when they die, he finds the way open to the approaching deliverance from the corpse, from the coffin and grave of the body, the prison-wall of which he has already in spirit burst asunder.[2]

[1] Concerning oaths, see especially *De decal.* p. 756: *βιωφελέστατον καὶ ἁρμόττον λογικῇ φύσει τὸ ἀνώμοτον—ὡς τοὺς λόγους ὅρκους εἶναι νομίζεσθαι.* Advice on this subject, *ib.* Man, *ἥμερον ζῶον, κοινωνίας καὶ ὁμονοίας συγγενές, De præm.* p. 924. *ἱερώτατον τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ κτημάτων,* Decalog. p. 763. Lending, *Præm.* p. 926.

[2] Flight from the world, *Præm.* p. 912. Marriage, comp. *Mund. opif.* p. 35.

In this condition of perfection—which is possible to every one, even to women and slaves, for no one is a slave by nature—the wise man is the truly rich man: he is the noble man, the free man, who can proudly utter the Sophoclean saying, God is my ruler, not any one among men! He is priest, and king, and prophet; he is no longer merely a son and scholar of the Logos, he is his companion, a son of God. For he who does that which is good, who serves God, and is ruled by the love of God, is, according to the Law itself, a son of God, a mortal follower (Diadoche) of the great immortal King, and Moses dares to call him—no more a man, but—a god of men.[1] In this connection, can the final assertion which converts the humiliating fact of the universality of sin into a triumph for the wise man be wanting, viz. that the wise man is sinless? Nay, the wise man appears before God with a life that challenges no reproach—blameless and pure with the purification of perfect virtue, the human spirit is the offering which is the most sacred and the most acceptable to God. The occasional sins of those who are great in virtue and truly holy are of such a character, that they would be reckoned as good deeds in others.[2] In this proud Greek, Stoical ideal of the wise man, in this earthly, corporeally transforming competition of the divinity which was buried in obscurity, the Jewish-Hellenistic consciousness never lost its humble subjection to the Father of all. Whilst the wise man moves himself and the world, God is the eternal charioteer and director of the world, the Being who wants nothing, but who imparts to all His children. It is of His goodness that He does not punish as a just Being, but bears with men as a gracious Being. With Him all things are possible;

Hilgenfeld, *Apokalyptik*, p. 253. Political life, *Spec. leg.* pp. 776 sq. Drinkable water, *Q. omn. prob.* p. 867. ἀληθινὸς πλοῦτος ἐν οὐρανῷ, *Præm.* p. 926. Corybantic fury, *Mund. opif.* p. 15. Stupor, *Præm.* p. 917. See generally, Zeller, pp. 645—662.

[1] Woman, *Nobil.* p. 909. Slave, *De septen. et fest.* pp. 1179 sqq. The wise man the noble man, *Nobil.* pp. 903 sqq. The free man, *Q. omn. prob. liber*, pp. 867 sq. Ruler of the world, p. 868. Son of God, *Q. omn. prob.* p. 871; *Decal.* p. 856.

[2] *Vict.* pp. 838, 845.

He can mould and prepare everything, even that which is almost incorrigible. All the world hopes to receive from Him forgiveness of sin; the Logos, the high-priest and intercessor, and the patriarchs, pray for this; He grants it, not for the world's sake, but of His own gracious nature, to those who can truly believe. He loves the humble, and saves those whom He believes to be worthy of salvation; His grace elects the pious before they are born, and gives them victory over sensuality, and steadfastness in virtue. He reveals Himself to holy souls by means of His Spirit; and by His inner light He leads those who are by nature too weak to understand even the outer world, beyond the limitations of human nature, to the divine nature.[1]

Philo's system, as a whole, is scientifically untenable. In the interests of an abstract, lifeless idea of God, it destroys the recognition of the world as subsisting in God. The divine principle is related to the world in only a very reserved and indirect manner; and the basis of the world, matter, stands in eternal dualism, not comprehended in God. This God is prevented by His whole nature, which recoils from any definition, from ever coming to a world; if He has a world, He is in the first place only its architect, and in the next place He has formed it only by the agency of intermediate beings which, shadow-like, fall back into His hidden depths as hastily as they, incomprehensible finite manifestations of God (Verendlichungen Gottes), had mysteriously arisen from them. A marvellous, contradictory theology: a God and a world which flee from each other, and yet in the same theology seek each other with the ardour of love. The world gives birth to a man who, as a Greek sage, is God living upon earth, and, as a pious Israelite, cannot rest till he as son

[1] *ἡνίοχος καὶ κυβερνήτης ἄγει ᾗ ἂν ἐθέλῃ, μηδενὸς προσδεόμενος ἄλλου, πάντα γὰρ θεῷ δυνατά, Opif. m.* p. 9. *πάντα ἐξευμαρίζει ὁ Θεὸς, ἃ ἂν ἐθελήσῃ καὶ τὰ δυσκατόρθωτα, Vita Mos.* I. p. 605. *χρηστὰ ἐλπίζειν οὐ δ' ἑαυτοὺς, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἵλεων φύσιν τοῦ συγγνώμην πρὸ κολάσεως ὁρίζοντος, De septen. et fest.* p. 1194. *ἐὰν πιστεύσωσιν (ἀψευδῶς, Præm.* p. 914), *ὅτι οἷς ἁμαρτημάτων εἰσέρχεται μεταμέλεια, ἵλεων τὸν θεὸν ἔχουσι, Vict.* p. 845. *τὸν ταπεινὸν ἀξιοῖ προνομίας, De vict. off.* p. 854. *ὅταν κρίνῃ τινὰ σωτηρίας ἄξιον, Præm.* p. 923. See also Zeller, pp. 657 sqq.

has found the Father that is above; and God, the far-off, unapproachable God, is satisfied only when He, a bounteous Giver and Father, is drawing the world and mankind to His heart—nay, only when the self-revelation of all the beams of His majesty becomes, by the complete fusion of the whole of the Old Testament idealism, at once the *Word* on the one hand, and *Man* on the other.[1]

As is the theology, such is the anthropology; and such also the Philonic morality, the crown of science. True wisdom consists in withdrawal from the world; enthusiastic ecstasy constitutes the highest recognition of God, who is to be apprehended only by force; and deliverance from matter is the highest virtue. Such a morality could produce ascetic fugitives from the world, but no morally operative, world-fashioning men. The Philonic wise man, though deserving of the greatest respect, was wanting in all that was necessary to make him a reformer of the world: he was unacquainted with the real evils of the world; he had no full and deep sympathy with the world, for he avoided social life as a folly; he denied the world—as did his God—in the very moment when he recognized it; and he celebrated the festival of divine blessedness on the abstract platform of egoistic self-sufficiency, while he boasted of being a citizen of the world, a friend of mankind, a patron of the dignity and sanctity of human nature. And even his blessedness was in the highest degree doubtful! At one time, it assumes the character of Greek pride in wisdom, while the Hebrew conscience never ceases to complain, and rather hopes for grace than is able to attain it; at

[1] The name Father given to God (also in the Book of Wisdom), *De mund. opif.* p. 33: *ἡ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα συγγένεια.* P. 36: *τὸν πατέρα κολάσεις ὁρίσαι.* But we must beware of identifying this conception of the Father with that of Jesus; as in the Old Testament, the Father is not one who is related by nature, but always the Creator, the mere *ζωοπλάστος* (*Leg. all.* p. 77), the *πεποιηκὼς γένεσιν*, *Q. rer. div. haer.* p. 485. *πατὴρ ὁ γεννήσας τὸν κόσμον*, *Q. det. pot. insid. sol.* p. 185. *ἀνὴρ καὶ πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων*, *ib.* p. 182. In the treatise, *Q. deus sit immutab.* p. 301, he shows that, since God *οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπος*, the expression, *God corrects man as a son*, also only *πρὸς τὴν τῶν πολλῶν διδασκαλίαν εἰσάγεται.* Comp. also Ewald, IV. p. 631, VI. p. 282.

another time, it relies vain-gloriously upon acts of self-denial, under which the whole man bleeds, and upon divine revelations, under the blind force of which human nature is disorganized.

Finally, the value of this infusion of new ideas in Judaism, this reformation of Judaism, must not be exaggerated. Undeniably, the issue was a purification and refinement, since the conception of the Divine Being assumed a form more worthy of God, the spiritual and moral kernel of Judaism was released from its shell, and that in Judaism which possessed a general human character was perspicuously shown to be essentially related to what was best in the best nations. But how much was dissipated and lost of Judaism, as well as of God and the world! The external ordinances of Israel especially sank irrecoverably into the dust. He who so often and so well, as an inexorable perfecter of the prophets, declared that God, being in need of nothing, required neither sacrifices nor vows, that He took no pleasure in the flesh and fat of beasts, that a grain of incense, a song of praise, nay, a blameless life, a noble disposition, was most worthy of God, and that the human soul, purified by virtue, was the noblest sacrifice; he who pronounced every day to be a feast day, and interpreted circumcision to mean purity of heart and the extirpation of carnal desires, such a one, however strongly he might personally advocate the retention of the outward ordinances, and however self-denyingly he might devote himself to the laborious task of interpreting every material detail, was altogether helpless to prevent the enlightened members of his party —even though he intimidated them by the judgment of the "multitude"—from rejecting the external shell which, according to his own admission, in a hundred ways led to the gross superstition of outward works.[1] He who reduced the whole of the revelation of Israel in a greater or less degree to what took place within

[1] *οὐ πολυσαρκίᾳ καὶ πιότητί ζώων χαίρει ὁ Θεὸς, ἀλλ' ανυπαιτίῳ τοῦ εὐξαμένου διαθέσει, Spec. leg.* p. 775. *ἀνεπιδεὴς, ib.* Also, *De victim.* pp. 839—849 sq. Feasts, *Septen. et fest.* p. 1174. Circumcision, *Circum.* pp. 810 sq. Superstition, *παραναπέφυκε κακὸν, δεισιδαιμονία, Plant. Noe.* p. 229. Comp. Herzfeld, III. p. 516.

the souls of holy men, and who asserted the equivalent recurrence of all revelation in the pious and the wise, could not prevent the withdrawal of faith from the great external facts of Israel; and still less could he prevent piety, indifferent to what was old, from remaining satisfied with the light which the Divine Spirit kindles in the pious man, to-day as well as yesterday. He who depreciated external communion, despised the material world, and ascribed to the wise man at all times and without stint the unimpaired blessedness of divine sonship, could not, without contradicting his own most peculiar ideas, inspire himself or others with enthusiasm on behalf of his nation, and its spiritually and materially blessed Messianic future, which to him, however, was already come. The firm foundation of the nation—its ordinances, its history, its future—was here completely undermined. The new illumination called everything in question, made everything unnecessary, renounced the very foundation upon which it stood, and achieved no sound progress because it soared in the air. Though it extolled Israel as the special people of God, to whom the eternal blessings of the knowledge of God and of morality had been committed in the sight of all the other nations, was it not compelled to renounce Israel, if Israel perpetuated merely the form, while the wise man among both Greeks and Jews laid hold of the essence?[1]

And yet, whatever faults we find, it must be remembered that history seldom works without mistakes, and that even overthrow is subservient to progress. It cannot be denied that a great number, and—notwithstanding a complete absence of systematizing—a real system, of elevated, refined, and at the same time genuinely religious conceptions of "the Father of all," of the world, which is God's handiwork, of man and his indelible worth and unalterable destiny, in spite of all his moral weakness, and of mankind as one family, found through Philo in part a wider currency, and in part a fresh and more emotional basis. At one

[1] He explains Israel as meaning *the God-seeing*, from אִישׁ (man), רָאָה (to see), אֵל (God). Comp. Ewald, VI. p. 248.

time Philo's utterances sound like an oracle of the prophets, at another like a saying of Jesus or the Apostles, at another like a sentence from Zeno or Seneca; he speaks in the languages of all tongues—the language of the modern world as well as of the centuries of old. He bears witness to the universal circulation of the great human ideas and of their immense and abiding force. And he is more than a witness,—he is himself a charioteer and director: though he has, neither as philosopher nor as religious reformer, discovered the uniting, constructive, and enigma-solving word, he nevertheless holds the position, among both Jews and Greeks, of preparer of the way for new ideas and for the interchange of ideas already popular. He was a forerunner of Jesus, though he did not know him, and was far from rising to his level. He scattered seed in Judaism, the noblest grains of which bore fruit in Christianity; he compelled the heathen world to cherish a deeper sympathy with the East; and he offered to incipient Christianity itself his dogmatic system, which, as something more than a set of subordinate opinions, perpetuated itself in Paul and John, and later in the Alexandrian church. Hence the beautiful belief of the Church that Philo was a Christian and the friend of Peter.[1]

Second Section.—Religion in the Holy Land.

In the Holy Land, religious questions did not exhibit the same features as they did abroad. The Holy Land was not, indeed, as we have in part already seen, completely closed against Greek influence. At the time when this Greek influence was beginning to be felt—after rather than before the time of Alexander the Great—the Old Testament book Ecclesiastes betrays a boundless and gloomy scepticism matured in the midst of a multitude of books,—a scepticism which with difficulty saves itself from an Epicurean wild despair of all

[1] Eus. 2, 17.

wisdom and of the whole of human life, and contradictorily retains faith in God and in retribution.[1] The elder Jesus the son of Sirach, the Hebrew author of a new Book of Wisdom in the beginning of the second century, preserved of the strong Israelitish faith only a vapid morality.[2] The mixture of religions, aided by the state of politics, forced itself to some extent even into the schools of those theologians who were orthodox and fundamentally opposed to heathenism. It was not only the Sadducees and Essenes who adopted foreign principles: from Antigonos of Socho, a man learned in the Scriptures and the first Jewish teacher who took a Greek name (cir. B.C. 200), down to the Rabban Gamaliel, Paul's teacher, a taste for the Greek language and culture was evinced; and great pains were taken to justify this taste from the Old Testament (Gen. ix. 27), while the rabbis had much difficulty in excusing Gamaliel, "the glory of the Law"—who, out of his thousand disciples, is said to have taught 500 in the Law, and 500 in the wisdom of the Greeks—by appealing to his influential position in the "kingdom," that is, in the government of the Herods.[3] In fact, a theology unmistakably tinged with Philonism, and which reached the holy soil by the instrumentality of the pilgrims from Egypt and even of the corn-ships from Alexandria, is presented to us in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and also in the Targums, i. e. in the Chaldean

[1] Comp. Ecclesiastes xii. 12, i. 18, ii. 16, ix. 2, iii, 19, 21, viii. 15; on the other hand, *e.g.* xii. 1, 13 sq. It is incomprehensible to me (even apart from the language) that many critics still hold the opinion that the book was composed at the close of the Persian period. Comp. De Wette, *Einl. in's A. T.* 7th ed. p. 382.

[2] Comp. Fritzsche's *Comm.* 1860; also the analysis in Ewald, IV. pp. 340 sqq. Jost, *Gesch. Judenthums*, I. pp. 310.

[3] The idea of the mixture of religions (ἐπιμιξία), 2 Macc. xiv. 3, iv. 13: ἀκμὴ τις Ἑλληνισμοῦ. Antigonos of Socho in Judæa, see *Pirke Ab.* 1, 3. Comp. below, the Pharisees. Ewald, IV. p. 357. Jost, *Gesch. Jud.* I. 1857, p. 106. Ewald assigns him, with his teacher, Simon the Just (B.C. 310—291), to the beginning of the third century. Jost and others place him, as a scholar of Simon II., with more probability at the close, at and after the time of Antiochus the Great (B.C. 224—187). Gamliel (Gamaliel), see Herzfeld, III. pp. 254; Jost, l. c. pp. 281 sqq. (also *Gesch. der Israel. seit der Zeit der Makkab.* III. p. 170). Grätz, III. pp. 274 sqq. Winer, Herzog. The Greek language, see Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* pp. 273 sq. Homer, comp. Geiger. *Sadd. und Phar.* 1863, p. 7.

commentaries of Onkelos and Jonathan, which tradition has brought more or less intimately into connection with Hillel and Gamaliel, the leading representatives of scriptural erudition. In the above writings, from Onkelos downwards — who may be designated a contemporary of Philo's — every material image used with reference to God in the Old Testament, such as face, mouth, eye, hand, breath, voice, is carefully converted into the corresponding conceptions of the divine glory, the divine indwelling presence, and the divine word (Jekara, Shechina, Memra).[1] The same system of paraphrase is found in the Book of Jubilees, which also had its origin in Palestine.[2] Josephus the Pharisee was also so far infected with Hellenism, that, anxious as he was to prove from Daniel and the fulfilment of his predictions, the ruling power of a Divine Providence, in opposition to the doctrine of the Epicureans, he nevertheless exhibits a preference for the cold and shallow epithets, Godhead, Daimonion, Fortune, the course of the world, Fate, to the name of God, and regards heathen augury with favour; and at the very moment when he overflows with pious praise of a protecting God, he concludes his account of his scarcely miraculous escape from death in the Galilean war with Rome and in the cave at Jotapata, with the naive dilemma, "whether his preservation was to be ascribed to good fortune or to Divine Providence." His doctrine of immortality is modern. His ideas of morality are for the most part shallow and insipid; yet he occasionally shows that he has drawn a deeper and nobler knowledge from the wells of human philosophy.[3] But, not to speak further of later Jewish writings, even the Apostle Paul, a disciple of Gamaliel at Jerusalem, was

[1] Comp., concerning the Targums, the recent detailed notice by Langen, pp. 70 sqq., 209—218. Also the introductions to the Old Testament and the article *Targumim*, in Herzog.

[2] In the first Christian century. Comp. Dillmann, Herzog, XII. p. 317. Langen, pp. 100 sq.

[3] Comp. *B. J.* 3, 8, 3, 7; *Ant.* 10, 11, 7; 15, 9, 1; *Cont. Ap.* 2, 16. Augury, *B. J.* 6, 5, 3. Immortality in heaven, *B. J.* 3, 8, 5. Moral truths, *e.g.*, *Con. Ap.* 2, 23. Langen, pp. 220 sqq. Also the same writer's treatise on the theological standpoint of Josephus, *Quartalschrift*, 1865, pp. 1 sqq.

largely imbued with Alexandrian ideas, which he very evidently transferred to the kernel of Christianity—his Christology.[1] The historian of the Jewish people, Josephus, was thus able to say without hesitation that the Jews were separated from the Greeks rather by situation than by habits; and he is naturally fond of drawing comparisons between the religious sects of his people and the Greek philosophies. He also mentions men of Greek culture, such as king Agrippa; learned contemporaries, such as Nicolaus, the historian of king Herod, and Justus, the son of Pistus in Tiberias; and, indeed, numerous aspirants to Greek science.[2]

Nevertheless, in this nation of the Law, especially in the holy places—the seat of antagonism—exclusiveness and hatred towards the stranger predominated. While even the foreign and more pliable Judaism never freed itself from the reproach perpetuated in the heathen — Greek and Roman — literature by Diodorus, Cicero, Juvenal, and Tacitus, but which was eagerly controverted by Philo and Josephus, viz., that the Jews were a nation of secret religious associations, and were sworn haters of mankind, the characteristic seclusion within the old bulwark of distinctive nationality was developed with far greater strength in the Holy Land and in Jerusalem.[3] The translation of the Bible into Greek was at first an occasion of grief, nay, of hatred, in Jerusalem.[4] The later fanatical rabbis, both before and after the destruction of Jerusalem, and in the death-struggle against Rome under Hadrian, excluded the friends of the foreign litera-

[1] Comp., concerning Paul, briefly, Schneckenburger, *Beitr. zur Einl. N. T.* 1832, pp. 94 sqq.; also my *Gesch. Christus*, p. 135.

[2] Nicolaus, Jos. *Ant.* 16, 7, 1, and elsewhere; *Vita*, 9 (Justus); *Con. Ap.* 2, 10 (similar characteristics); *Ant.* 20, 11, 2 (aspirants).

[3] Cic. *Pro Flacc.* 28, Diod. 34, Ph. I. Juven. 14, 103 sqq. Tac. *Hist.* 5, 5: Adversus omnes alios hostile odium. 3 Macc. vii. 4: *τρὸς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη δυσμένεια.* Also Jos. *Con. Ap.* 1, 34; 2, 10, 14. On the other hand, Josephus against Apion, and Philo against Flaccus.

[4] *Massechet sopherim*, 1, 7, in Lightfoot, p. 253. V. seniores scripserunt legem græce pro Ptolemæo rege fuitque iste dies acerbus Israeli, sicut dies, quo factus est vitulus, eo quod lex non potuit verti secundum quod est ei necessarium. Comp. Grätz, III. 36.

ture from eternal life; they laid the same curse upon those who educated their sons in the wisdom of the Greeks (chochmat jewanit), as upon the possessors of swine; while others who were milder, permitted the reading of Homer as the reading of a "letter." But the stricter rabbis merely expressed the national spirit.[1] Not only Origen, but Josephus also—notwithstanding his coquetting with the foreigner—bear witness to the instinctive repugnance of the nation. While taking to himself the credit, at the close of his Antiquities, of having written such a book for the Greeks as neither Jew nor foreigner had hitherto been able to write, he claims praise for his achievement, as a Jew, on the ground of the national exclusiveness, which, in spite of his Greek studies, had prevented even him from acquiring a fluent Greek pronunciation. This was the result of national custom, he said, for among the Jews those persons were not cordially received who had learned many languages, and who adorned their speech with elaborate diction: it was thought that such accomplishments were not privileges peculiar to the free, but were within the reach of any *slave* who wished to possess them. *They* only were pronounced wise who had an exact and correct understanding of the Law and the Scriptures. This is the explanation of the fact that among so many who had occupied themselves with Greek, barely two or three had turned it to any noteworthy account.[2]

While the world in general either unbelievingly threw away religion altogether, or most remarkably overleapt the native religions and adopted the foreign, especially the Eastern, even the Jewish, the national spirit of the Jews, on the contrary, instead of yielding to dissolution, braced itself to an heroic resistance which even the haughty Roman Tacitus appreciates,

[1] *Tr. Sanhedr.* (R. Akiba): Nec eum participem esse vitæ æternæ, qui libros alienigenarum legit.—Execrabilis esto, qui alit porcos, execrabilis item, qui docet filium suum sapientiam græcam. Gfrörer, *Jahrb. Heils*, p. 115. Herzfeld, III. pp. 254 sqq. Jost, III. 99.

[2] Jos. *Ant.* 20, 11, 2 (ἡ περὶ τὴν προφορὰν ἀκρίβεια). Comp. also Gfrörer, l. c. Kuhn, *L. J.* I. p. 435.

in at least one particular,—the Jews, he says, refused to kings the flattery of images, and to emperors that of worship. For the second time the nation grasped the sharp sword of the Maccabees; but that sword was now transfigured, for the war was waged with intellectual weapons. For the second time, Moses stood forth: never before had the watchword of the Law been repeated with such energy, and instead of the bulwark of mountains and deserts which Moses had sought, every breast became a fortress against which Greece and Rome stormed in vain. Josephus, as well as Philo, extolled the Lawgiver, the ideal type of all the Greeks; the zealous missionary teachers of the Law proclaimed his ordinances through east and west; and even the Christian Jews at Rome found in the Law a staunch support against the Gentile Christians.[1] In Palestine itself flourished a numerous and distinguished professional class of exegetists, the expounders of the Law (lawyers, scribes), the representatives of Pharisaism. At their feet in the courts and halls of the temple, in the synagogues, those important schools of the spiritual ordinances of Israel (the description of which we reserve until we treat of the youth of Jesus), and in the teaching-houses, sat hundreds of enthusiastic youths and men (the poor scholars being supported out of the sacred tithes), and the mass of the people were also attentive listeners. Hence resulted an exact acquaintance with the Law, to its very details, among all circles of society, among the women also, even among slaves; and hence resulted a diligent study at home, and the education of the children in the knowledge of the Scriptures. The Jew, said Josephus, knows the Law better than his own name.[2] The sacred rules were punctually observed; these rules, according to Philo and Josephus, hovered as ineffaceable images before the

[1] Tac. *Hist.* 5, 5 : Non regibus hæc adulatio, non Cæsaribus honor. Jos. *Con. Ap.* 2, 16. Missionaries, *Ant.* 20, 2, 4; 18, 3, 5. Juvenal, *Sat.* 6, 544: Interpres legum Solymarum. Rom. ii. 17 : ἐπαναπαύῃ τῷ νόμῳ.

[2] Teachers of the Law, τῶν πατρίων ἐξηγηταὶ νόμων, *Ant.* 17, 6, 2. The people's acquaintance with the Law, *Con. Ap.* 1, 12; 2, 18. Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* p. 1022. Places of assembly, comp. Herzfeld, III. 266.

soul from childhood; they were hedged in by a multitude of minute and oppressive particulars, devised by the scribes from the time of the exile, from the time of Ezra the scribe to that of Jesus the deliverer. The uncleanness of the Gentiles was an axiom of the Law: hence anxious avoidance and even mistrust of the poor peasants taken prisoners in war, and hence the exclusion from marriage with the priests of the female descendants of those priestly families which had fallen into the hands of their enemies the Romans under Pompey or Quinctilius Varus.[1] The priesthood was held in high honour, although the respect shown to it was due to the teachers of the Law, who had become the spiritual leaders of the people. The priests took rank as the true nobility of Israel; the offerings presented to them were for the most part voluntary, and indeed were accompanied with felicitations and thanksgiving, as if the obligation were on the side of the giver; and their official acts, especially sacrifices, were performed in the midst of reverent crowds.[2] These mediators between God and the people, however, failed to preserve, even during the reign of a Herod, not only the purity of their descent, but also that of their outward life: towards the end of Herod's reign, the high-priest Matthias was compelled, on account of pollution, to vacate his office for a day, the great day of atonement.[3] Even the service at night, at least during the feasts, was carefully maintained. The sacrificial service was so punctually kept up, that it was an admitted fact that whoever was in possession of the place of sacrifice, was master of the holy city, since the people could not forego the sacrifice. When Herod besieged Jerusalem, the besieged considered it a

[1] Jos. *Con. Ap.* 1, 7. Hence the demand of the Pharisee Eleazar that John Hyrcanus should lay down his high-priestly office, because his mother had been a captive under Antiochus Epiphanes, *Ant.* 13, 10, 5.

[2] Priesthood, τεκμήριον γένους λαμπρότητος, as with others εὐγένεια, Jos. *Vita*, 1. Gifts to the priests, Philo, *De sacerdot. honor.* p. 832. Participation of the people, Luke i. 10, 21; comp. 2 Macc. iii. 18. Later, the theory of the necessary "standing round" (maamad), Herzfeld, III. p. 188.

[3] Jos. *Ant.* 17, 6, 4; *Con. Ap.* 1, 7.

mere matter of justice that he should allow the sacrificial beasts to be brought in, and he was politic enough to make this concession. When the city was taken by Pompey, under Archelaus, and also on the occasion of an armed attack by Pilate, those who were sacrificing persisted in remaining at the altars, and human blood was literally mingled with that of the sacrifices.[1] The law of the Sabbath was generally so conscientiously observed, that on the Sabbath victory was not followed up, and the Sabbath rest threw the city into the hands of Pompey, as it had already done into those of the first Ptolemy. In the midst of the greatest national distress, in B.C. 37, the Sabbatic year was observed. The great feasts were frequented by countless thousands, though the Mosaic rule of attendance at the feasts thrice a year had long been in abeyance. At the feast of the Passover, the worshippers began to assemble in the temple courts at midnight. At the last Passover before the war under Nero, in A.D. 66, three millions are said to have been assembled there; indeed, at the instance of the Syrian governor, Cestius Gallus, who wished to heighten Nero's uneasiness, the priests counted the beasts offered in sacrifice: it was found that there were 256,500, and that at least 2,700,000 persons were present at the feast. According to a rabbinical fable, king Agrippa caused a census of the Passover celebrants to be taken, by collecting the kidneys of the beasts that were sacrificed: 600,000 pairs of kidneys were collected, and it was calculated that there were twice as many celebrants as came out of Egypt,—thus, at an estimate of at least ten persons to each lamb, the number of persons was computed to be not six millions merely, but twelve. The above-mentioned Cestius found the town of Lydda empty, the inhabitants being at the feast of Tabernacles. On account of the crowds that came to the feasts, the garrison was strengthened

[1] Jos. *Ant.* 15, 7, 8: *τούτων (πόλις, ἱερὸν) οἱ κρατοῦντες ὑποχείριον τὸ πᾶν ἔθνος ἐσχήκασι. τὰς μὲν γὰρ θυσίας οὐκ ἄνευ τούτων οἷόν τε γενέσθαι.* Night attendance at the temple, *Ant.* 18, 2, 2; *B. J.* 6, 5, 3. Herod's siege, *Ant.* 14, 16, 2. Pompey, *ib.* 14, 4, 3. Archelaus, *ib.* 17, 9, 3. Pilate, Luke xiii. 1.

on such occasions, and the procurator from Cæsarea, or the Syrian governor, was present; the crowded feasts also afforded opportunity for the plotting of revolts, and were the scenes of an enormous sacrifice of human life, either by slaughter or by the pressure of the crowds.[1] Over and above the requirements of the Law, ascetic religious exercises, advocated by the teachers of the Law, came into vogue,—such as hours of prayer, constant attendance in the temple, washings, fasts, almsgivings, celibacy, and the Nazarite vow which, either temporarily or for life, was taken by hundreds—all good works which purified the man, and won divine revelations and reward in heaven.[2] We have already seen Agrippa's admiration of the sacred purity of the Jerusalemites.[3] With a strength of will which can be fully appreciated only when it is measured by the degenerate character of Greece and Rome, the Jew preferred death to the violation of the Law by a word or a letter; even the Hellenized and Alexandrian Jews under Caligula died on the cross and by fire, and the Palestinian prisoners in the last war died by the claws of African lions in the amphitheatre, rather than sin against the Law. What Greek, exclaims Josephus, would do the like? The Greek would have allowed the whole of his native literature to be burnt, since he saw in it nothing but human invention.[4] The Jews also exhibited an ardent zeal for

[1] Sabbath, *Ant.* 13, 8, 4; 14, 4, 2; 15, 1, 2; comp. 12, 1, 1, and 6, 2; 13, 1, 3. Sabbatic year, *ib.* 14, 16, 2. Festivals, *B. J.* 2, 14, 3; 6, 9, 3; *Ant.* 18, 2, 2; 19, 1. The twelve millions, in Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* p. 653. For, notwithstanding the *paria renum*, only *renem unum* from each lamb. Ten persons the minimum, *B. J.* 6, 9, 3; Lightfoot, l. c. Sacrifice of human life, comp. the 3000 under Archelaus, *B. J.* 2, 6, 2; 20,000 under Cumanus, *Ant.* 20, 5, 3. Crushing by the crowd, comp. *pascha compressum*, Lightf. p. 653.

[2] Comp. below, the Pharisees; and, generally, Hilgenfeld, *Apokalyptik*, p. 253. The beginnings, after the exile, increased καθαρότης; see the latest prophets, Daniel, the Apocrypha, Philo, the Essenes. In the New Testament, Luke ii. 36 sq. The Nazarite vow, comp. *B. J.* 2, 15, 1; Acts xviii. 18, xxi. 23. Grätz, III. pp. 466 sq. Jost, I. p. 239. Winer, *R. W.* II. 164.

[3] ἁγιστεία, Philo, p. 1033.

[4] *Con. Ap.* 1, 8. Comp. the hecatombs of Titus among the Jewish captives, *B. J.* 7, 2, 1; 7, 3, 1; 7, 5, 1, &c. Also, Philo, *In Flacc.* and *Leg. ad Caj.*

the conversion of the Gentiles to the Law of Moses: the proselytes filled Asia Minor and Syria, and—to the indignation of Tacitus—Italy and Rome, where mothers made vows to the Jewish Jupiter, and Pharisaic fasts on Thursdays and lustrations in the Tiber came into vogue. Ananias, a Jewish merchant, converted, in the reign of the emperor Claudius, the royal family of Adiabene,—first the women, then the prince; and so politic was he in his zeal, that in order to gain his purpose he even dissuaded the prince from circumcision, until Eleazar, a Galilean teacher of the Law, induced the prince to submit to that rite.[1]

It was a natural result of the state of things above described, that the Jews exhibited a mistrustful watchfulness against every threatened desecration of the sanctuary, and an heroical determination to resist to the death every attack made by insolent heathenism; and, at the same time, gratitude for every exhibition of Roman tolerance, as shown by Pompey, Cæsar, Augustus, and Agrippa.[2] We found examples in Herod's reign. Others can be drawn from the times immediately following. When Pilate, at the very beginning of his procuratorship (cir. A.D. 26), wished to put an end to the national isolation, and, contrary to the example of his predecessors, furnished the troops that came from Samaria into winter quarters in Jerusalem with Roman ensigns bearing silver busts of the emperor, on the very first

[1] Comp. Matt. xxiii. 15; Rom. x. 2; Hor. *Sat.* 1, 4, 143: Ac veluti te Judæi cogemus in hanc concedere turbam. *Sat.* 1, 9, 70 sq.: Sum paullo infirmior, unus multorum. Tac. *Hist.* 5, 5: Transgressi in morem eorum idem usurpant, &c. The impostors at Rome under Tiberius, *Ant.* 18, 3. Washing and fasting at Rome, Hor. *Sat.* 2, 3, 288; comp. Nauck on the passage. The many proselytes in Asia Minor, Syria, and Rome, see Josephus (comp. *B. J.* 2, 20, 2; *Con. Ap.* 2, 39), and Philo (comp. *In Flacc.* p. 971; *Leg. ad Caj.* p. 1022). Also the New Testament, and Dio Cas. 60, 6. Foreigners at the festivals, *B. J.* 6, 9, 3. The conversion of the royal family at Adiabene, *Ant.* 20, 2, 3 sqq.

[2] Pompey had entered the Holy of Holies, had seen, without laying hands upon, the temple treasure (about 2000 talents), and had commanded the continuance of the sacrifices, and even the purification of the temple after its occupation by the Romans. Comp. *Ant.* 11, 8 (Alexander); 14, 4, 4 (Pompey); Suet. *Cæs.* 84 (lamentations of the Jews after the death of Cæsar). Agrippa, see above, p. 242. Comp. Philo, *Leg.* p. 1021: *δυσανασχετήσαντες ἐπὶ τῷ τῆς ἱερᾶς χώρας τὸ ἱεροπρεπὲς ὄντως ἀφανίζεσθαι.*

morning the people revolted against the heathen symbols which had been cautiously introduced during the night. They went *en masse* to Cæsarea, to entreat the governor to withdraw the banners. Day and night, for five days, they remained in the market-place, and refused to be driven away, since the governor declined to accede to what he considered an affront to the emperor; and when, on the sixth day, the governor, standing on the tribune in the great hippodrome, caused his troops to surround the Jews, and at a given signal to advance upon them in triple rank with drawn swords, the Jews unanimously threw themselves to the ground, bared their necks, and offered to die rather than transgress the Law. At this, even a Pilate was seized with admiration of their "boundless piety," and ordered the images to be taken to Cæsarea.[1] A little later, Pilate believed he was doing a laudable act, when, like a true Roman, he brought a great aqueduct—twenty-three or even forty-six miles long—into Jerusalem, and paid for this useful and opportune work with the treasure that lay idle in the temple, from which treasure some provision was already made for the supply of pure water. But the Jews appreciated this enlightened policy neither at this period nor later, when, out of mistrust of the Romans, they applied the temple treasure to building purposes in the temple; they demanded that the departments should be kept separate, and that the progress of the works should be arrested; and the masses gave vent to loud abuse of the governor.[2] On this occasion the latter carried his point, by causing his soldiers to fall

[1] *B. J.* 2, 9, 2, 3. (*τὸ τῆς δεισιδαιμονίας ἄκρατον*). *Ant.* 18, 3, 1. *B. J.* shows the commencement of the procuratorship. For the religious significance of those images among the heathen themselves, see Jost, I. p. 333.

[2] Jos. *B. J.* 2, 9, 4 (400 stadia); *Ant.* 18, 3, 2 (200 stadia); 20, 9, 7. Jost, I. p. 333, with an appeal to Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 36, 65! thinks of the coast-stream Belus; but that is too distant (at Ptolemais, *B. J.* 2, 10, 2). Others, including Ewald (V. 1st ed. p. 36), think of the conduits leading from Bethlehem; but that is too near. A surplus of temple income, which went to form the treasure, was indeed ultimately spent by the Jews themselves in aqueducts, walls, and towers for Jerusalem (*Shekal.* 6, ap. Grätz, III. p. 124). But at any rate they wished to dispose of it themselves, and to ward off a dangerous and extensive attack upon the treasure. How spitefully they could abuse is seen in 2 Macc. iv. 41; *B. J.* 2, 14, 6.

upon the people craftily and like assassins; but, later, towards the close of his misrule (between A.D. 32—34), the then taciturn nation was able to get the mastery in what seemed to be simply a matter of harmless gratification of his private taste. He caused to be hung up in his palace at Jerusalem, in Herod's royal palace, not banners, but merely gilded shields without images of Victory, though possessing certainly a flattering dedicatory inscription to Tiberius. This became known to the people, who—like Philo—believed in some ulterior purpose, and became uneasy; they implored the intercession of Herod's sons and of the aristocracy, and when Pilate refused to yield, they clamoured against him as the "rebel," demanded to see the emperor's letter and handwriting, and threatened to send an embassy to Rome. Pilate, obstinate, though inwardly regretting his act, received from the emperor Tiberius, to whom written complaints had been sent, and who was less willing that the "gods" should be left to take care of themselves in Palestine than elsewhere, an express and angry command to remove the shields, which then quickly travelled by the well-known road to Cæsarea, there to adorn unmolested the temple of Augustus.[1]

A few years later, when, under Vitellius (A.D. 36, 37), the land and its religion had for a moment brilliantly triumphed, and in the presence of the governor himself had celebrated the Passover with demonstrative rejoicings in honour of the new emperor Caligula, began, in the summer of A.D. 38, at the time of this emperor's crazy self-apotheosis, which was fitly associated with a Gentile hatred of the Jews and of their new and pompous king Agrippa, the persecutions against the Jews, first of all in Alexandria, where the people, with the connivance and afterwards with the co-operation of the governor Avillius Flaccus, placed

[1] Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* pp. 1033 sq. *Clupei*, see Mommsen, pp. 103 sq. This occurrence certainly took place towards the end of the many misdeeds of Pilate, after the death of Sejanus (A.D. 31), and before the Samaritan revolt (A.D. 35). Philo, *Leg.* p. 1015. Grätz, III. 489 sq., confounds the quite distinct incidents of the images and the shields. The gods, Tac. *Ann.* 1, 73: Deorum injurias Diis curæ.

images of the gods and of the emperor in the Jewish synagogues.[1] It is true that, contrary to all expectation, the displeasure of the emperor, not appeased even by the persecution of the Jews (August, A.D. 38), put an end, in the autumn of the same year (at the feast of Tabernacles), to the attempts of the governor, whom he suddenly cast into prison; but the enmity continued to exist. In the beginning of A.D. 39, while it was still winter, two embassies set out for Italy, Philo at the head of the Jewish, and Apion of the Alexandrian embassy. The Jewish ambassadors had not only to endure all the insolence of the emperor, but, while following him in his capricious removals from place to place in Campania, they heard with a cry of anguish the terrible news of his intention of placing a colossal image of himself, with the pretended inscription, "Zeus the manifested, the new Zeus, Caius," in the Holy of Holies in the temple at Jerusalem—of course, in grateful recognition of the fact that Jerusalem, as the first city of the East, had in the presence of Vitellius celebrated with hecatombs the emperor's exaltation to the throne.[2] The wrath of the emperor had been inflamed not only by the instigations of the Alexandrians and of the imperial court, but also by the demolition by the Jewish populace of an insignificant brick altar to the emperor in the Philistine town of Jamnia (Jabneh, the private property of the imperial house, inherited from Salome), which occurrence was officiously reported

[1] Vitellius, see above, p. 268. Self-deification; see Suet. *Cal.* 22, 24, 33, 52. Dio Cass. 59, 11, 26—30. Aur. Vict. *Epit.* 3. Jos. *Ant.* 19, 1, 1, 2. Relation to the Jews, Philo, *In Flacc.* p. 965. The beginning in Alexandria occurred, not in the first—as might be supposed from p. 966—but in the second year of Caligula (*Ant.* 18, 6, 11), and in the height of the summer (July) of A.D. 38, so that the persecution was raging most severely (Philo, p. 977) at the time of Caligula's birthday (Aug. 31, Suet. *Cal.* 8).

[2] Cessation of the governor's attempt, at the feast of Tabernacles, Philo, p. 982. The embassy (*Ant.* 18, 8, 1) in the winter of A.D. 39, Philo, *Leg. ad. Caj.* p. 1019. Report of it, pp. 1017 sqq. Comp. above, p. 273, note. The (later) inscription, p. 1040. The celebration at Jerusalem of Caligula's accession, p. 1025. Grätz, III. 364, fixes the embassy not earlier than the summer of A.D. 40! Ewald, VI. pp. 310 sq., gives A.D. 39, 40, quite inconsistently with his preceding remarks.

in Rome by the imperial treasurer Capito, who hoped thus to earn forgiveness for a number of frauds.[1] Publius Petronius, the governor of Syria, the successor of Vitellius (from A.D. 38), was instructed to march to Jerusalem with half the border-troops stationed on the Euphrates; to erect the image; and, in the event of opposition, to put to death the insurgents and sell the rest of the people into slavery.[2] With a heavy heart, a servant of the emperor, but also well acquainted with the Jewish people, and knowing how great would be the force of an insurrection extending from Babylon to the West, Petronius, in the autumn of A.D. 39, set out towards Ptolemais with two legions and numerous auxiliaries; he engaged Phœnician artists, built the work-shed in Sidon, and reported to the emperor that the Jewish campaign would begin in the spring of A.D. 40.[3] Yet he wished to prepare for it beforehand; and in the autumn of A.D. 39, he summoned before him the most distinguished Jews, priests, and leaders, and counselled submission.[4] But the times of such capitulation with heathenism as had taken place in the days of Antiochus were over, not only in Israel, but even in Herod's house. A death-like stillness followed the governor's words, then loud weeping, the rending of hair and beard, and finally the cry that it were better to die. The tidings had scarcely reached

[1] *Ant.* 18, 8, 1. Philo, *Leg. ad. Caj.* pp. 1020 sqq. Ewald, VI. p. 298, inaccurately speaks of an image.

[2] Philo, p. 1022. *Ant.* 18, 8, 2. According to Philo's earlier and more faithful account, Petronius had already been for a long time in Syria; according to Josephus, he was sent from Italy for this express purpose. If we prefer Philo's account, therefore, Petronius came at any rate in A.D. 38, not so late as A.D. 39, 40 (as Gerlach says, p. 63). The year 40 (although supported also by Ewald, VI. p. 299) is not to be thought of. Grätz is passionately opposed to Philo, pp. 487 sq.

[3] Jos. *B. J.* 2, 10; *Ant.* 18, 8, 2. Philo, pp. 1022—1024. According to *B. J.* § 1, three legions, and § 3, an image, already in Ptolemais.

[4] Philo, p. 1024. That the first negociation with the Jews occurred in the autumn of A.D. 39 (Ewald, VI. pp. 299 sqq., and Grätz, p. 269, place it in A.D. 40), and not in the following spring, is necessarily certain, not only from the reference to autumn, *B. J.* 2, 10, 1, *Ant.* 18, 8, 2, and from the many negociations that followed and that took place in the beginning of spring, but also from the Jewish reminiscence that the first intelligence was received at the feast of Tabernacles, *Megill. Taanit*, cap. 11. Grätz, p. 269.

Jerusalem, at the time of the feast of Tabernacles, A.D. 39, when innumerable multitudes of men, women, and children, literally covering the ground, flocked towards Phœnicia, strewed themselves with dust and ashes, uttered loud lamentations for the Law, the temple—their holiest thing—and implored delay. Not merely the mild, cultured Petronius, but also the sternest Romans among his assessors, though prompted both by their nature and their fear of the emperor to long for war, were moved, and it was decided to postpone the matter once more.[1]

At the time of the spring sowing, in January or February, A.D. 40, Petronius, accompanied by friends and counsellors, travelled from Ptolemais to Tiberias, on the lake of Gennesareth —the nearest Jewish city of importance, formerly the residence of Antipas, and at this time of Agrippa—in order to observe the disposition of the people more closely.[2] Fully aware that the moment was a decisive one, thousands again flocked together. "Will you, can you wage war with the emperor?" "We are willing to die," they cried, throwing themselves to the ground and proffering their necks. Thus they besieged him for forty days; in their anxiety for the honour of God, none thought of the sowing, for which it was now high time. In addition to the people, came the aristocracy, headed by Aristobulus, the brother of king Agrippa, who was again gone to Rome: they begged Petronius to describe the state of things to the emperor. The governor called the Jews together afresh at Tiberias; he alarmed them by surrounding them with troops; but he gave way, and promised to write to Caligula, insisting at the same time upon the quiet cultivation of the land.[3] The nation had, by its firmness, conquered iron Rome and its legions, which returned to Antioch; while an unexpected and fructifying fall of rain was

[1] Philo, pp. 1024 sqq. *Ant.* 18, 8, 2.

[2] *Ant.* 18, 8, 3. Josephus himself indicates a pause; Philo, the spring. Ewald, p. 303, narrowly escapes being correct, but nevertheless persists in placing the whole late in the autumn of A.D. 40.

[3] *Ant.* 18, 8, 4—6.

regarded as a divine acknowledgment of Petronius and of the people's piety.[1] The question of images, in which Judaism obtained quite unexpectedly the sympathy of all the reasonable and free men of Rome, and also commendation in the Annals of Tacitus, still experienced vicissitudes. Petronius directed the artists not to hurry, and in March or April wrote as discreetly as possible to Caligula concerning the immediately impending harvest, having in view also the approaching journey of the emperor to the East.[2] The emperor suppressed his anger, and it was not until the beginning of the summer of A.D. 40 that he insisted upon despatch; and even then, on the personal and importunate intercession of king Agrippa, in the autumn of the same year, he postponed the dedication of the image; yet out of Jerusalem liberty had to be allowed to every one to pay divine honours to the emperor.[3] But no such honours were anywhere paid. He then reverted to his former purpose; he ordered the preparation of the statue in Rome, intending to take it with him on his journey to Alexandria, and to place it secretly in the temple; and, in December, A.D. 40, he wrote to Petronius threatening him, as a corrupt ruler, with speedy punishment.[4] He immediately afterwards imagined that a voice from the Holy of Holies had gone forth to warn him, the new Antiochus, of his approaching end; he died, January 24th, A.D. 41, under the sword of Chærea; and Petronius, in the eyes of the nation the object of God's visible

[1] *Ant.* 18, 8, 6. Drought *τὸ πᾶν ἔτος*, reckoned from the harvest month Tisri (rosh hashanah), also points to the spring.

[2] See Philo, pp. 1027 sq.: *ἐν ἀκμῇ τὸν τοῦ σίτου καρπὸν εἶναι.*

[3] Philo, pp. 1028—1038. *Ant.* 18, 8, 7 sqq. Despatch commanded in the beginning of the summer, Philo, p. 1029 (the harvest may have been over). Agrippa in the autumn: Caligula did not return from the German campaign until August 31, A.D. 40. Suet. 49. Philo and Josephus do not quite agree here; in particular, Philo's account of Agrippa's intercession differs from that of Josephus, who mentions a request made at a meal. Then the sequel of the letters differs in the two accounts. Philo's account is older and soberer. The amplification in the other account is not difficult of detection.

[4] Philo, pp. 1038—1040. *Ant.* 18, 8, 8. Suet. *Cal.* 49.

protection, received the news of the emperor's death before his ungracious letter.[1]

Notwithstanding the prevalent legalism, the moral condition of the people was very corrupt. Yet such a noble nation could never be altogether wanting in high-minded and irreproachable men. Not only were Philo and his brother men of this class; not only could Josephus describe his father—to say nothing of himself—as a pattern of Jewish uprightness; but the Gospels also at the very outset mention righteous and blameless men. Jesus speaks sometimes of the righteous who, though persecuted by men, have no need of repentance before God; and at other times of the pure in heart, the meek, the compassionate, the peacemakers, the humble, the mourners, those who hunger after righteousness, the poor in spirit, who, in the prevailing physical and spiritual necessities of Israel, wait for redemption.[2] But it is precisely the persecuted righteous and the suffering patriots that lend to the age its character as a time of disaster. It was not merely foreign oppression, nor foreign corruption, that led to

[1] *Ant.* 18, 8, 9. Suet. 49, 58. Also Tac. *Hist.* 5, 9 (inexact): Dein jussi a C. Cæsare, effigiem ejus in templo locare, arma potius sumsere: quem motum Cæsaris mors diremit. The voice, in Herzfeld, II. p. 377. Caligula's plenipotentiary was already at Antipatris, that is, the station midway between Cæsarea and Jerusalem (Acts xxiii. 31), when the news of Caligula's death arrived. The menacing letter of the emperor, according to *B. J.* 2, 10, 5, *fin.*, in December or January.

[2] Jos. *Vita*, 2. Comp. the self-righteousness in the Apocrypha: ἐπλήσθην δικαιοσύνης, *Psalter. Salom.* 1, 2, 3; comp. 9, 9. From the New Testament, Luke i. 6, ii. 25; Matt. v. 3 sqq., ix. 13, xviii. 13. One of the noblest men of the age preceding John and Jesus, a patriot without equal, in truth a very prophet, only without antagonism to the priests, is Onias, the friend of God (*Ant.* 14, 2, 1, 2: δίκαιος ἀνὴρ καὶ θεοφιλής), whose prayer brought rain to the land in time of extreme drought. In the dissensions between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus—the latter of whom held possession of Jerusalem and kept the priesthood for himself—Onias withdrew sorrowing into privacy; but (B.C. 65) was forcibly brought into the camp of Aretus and Hyrcanus, in order to curse Aristobulus and his party. When he found that no resistance on his part availed anything, he stood forth in the midst and prayed, "O God, the King of the whole world, since these that stand around me are Thy people, and those that are besieged are Thy priests, I beseech Thee neither to hearken to those against these, nor to bring to pass what these ask for against those." He was at once stoned; the immediate answer of God, however, was a storm, which destroyed all the produce of the fields and occasioned a famine.

moral declension; it was the external legalism itself which invited decay. The Law had reference to the disposition, but still more to the outward act; and a school of teachers that had lost the spirit of the prophets encouraged and praised the outward righteousness which, in the descriptions given in the Sibylline books of the unworldly customs of holy men, assumes so beautiful and ennobling a character, but which, in many of the sayings and writings of the time, is so repulsive—as the reader will find on referring to the apocryphal books, including the Psalms of Solomon, the Jubilees, and the fourth book of Esdras. It is very characteristic of the spirit of the nation that insurrections and bloodshed took place particularly at the great festivals. When the insurgents, led by the teachers of the Law, after Herod's death, had destroyed a whole Roman cohort, they quietly returned to the Passover.[1] Thus, sacrifice continued to be offered in the temple at Jerusalem to the very last, while the contending parties were shedding blood and committing all kinds of atrocity before the altar itself. There exists abundant evidence of the depravity of the people, notwithstanding all their praiseworthy characteristics. The whole Gentile world, from the Greeks to Seneca and Tacitus—as the Apostle Paul knew—decried the abandonedly vicious nation. The pious fraud in Rome under Tiberius (B.C. 19) is an illustration of the national depravity. The Pharisees cursed the people; the Essenes emigrated and charged all married persons with unfaithfulness, without contradiction from Hillel and the Pharisees. The Apostle Paul, on the one hand, boasts of the zeal of his nation for the ordinances of God, and, on the other, finds the people only not quite so depraved, impure, unjust, and corrupt as the Gentiles; he accuses his countrymen of dishonouring God by adultery, theft, and sacrilege.[2] The history of Jesus tells of many forms of disease, of

[1] *Sibyll.* iii. 151 sqq. *Ant.* 17, 9, 3.

[2] Apollon. Mol. ap. Jos. *Con. Ap.* 2, 14, 12, 20: *ἀφυέστατοι βαρβάρων.* Seneca ap. Aug. *Civ. D.* 6, 11: Sceleratissima gens. Tac. *Hist.* 5, 8: Teterrima gens. *Ib.* 5, 5: Projectissima ad libidinem gens. The imposture of the teachers of the Law at

frightful manifestations of insanity, in which we see the accumulated fruit of blind superstition, of moral self-destruction, of national and social dissolution. The horrors of murder, refined cruelty, violation of promise, and immorality, which come before us in the Jewish war (before A.D. 70), and which find their earliest roots in the so-called Zealots as far back as the time of the youth of Jesus, were but the outgrowth of this corruption ripened into maturity by the wretchedness of the outward condition; and the national historian, while in harmony with Philo as to the rarity of transgressions of the Law, declares that the nation had become so wicked and depraved, that the holy city would have been swallowed up by an earthquake, or destroyed by a deluge, or overthrown by Sodomitic lightning, had not the Romans executed judgment upon it.[1]

Third Section.—The Messianic Expectation.

In the midst of these enormous antagonisms of the ideal and the actual, of the claim to be the special people of God, together with a glowing zeal for God's honour, and the actually existing servitude and disruption, nay, of physical and moral wretchedness, this marvellous nation ever busied itself afresh with the sublime and holy picture of a better and ideal future, a future usually expressed by the phrase, the *Messianic age*.[2] The de-

Rome, see above, pp. 266. Pharisees, John vii. 49: ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος ἐπικατάρατοί εἰσι. Essenes, *B. J.* 2, 8, 1. Hillel, &c., *Pirke ab.* 2, 7; 1, 5. Paul, Rom. ii. 17 sqq., ix. 3 sqq.

[1] *B. J.* 5, 13, 6; also 5, 10, 5; 7, 8, 1. On the other hand, *Con. Ap.* 2, 18, the apologetic assertion, καὶ στάνιος μὲν ὁ παραβαίνων, ἀδύνατος δ' ἡ τῆς κολάσεως παραίτησις. Philo, *Leg.* p. 1022; *In Flacc.* p. 972. Josephus dates the later Zealotism, with all its extravagances, from Judas the Galilean, *Ant.* 18, 1, 1.

[2] Comp. Colani's *Jésus-Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps*, 2nd ed. 1864. Knobel, *Prophetismus d. Hebräer*, 1837. Ewald, *Die Proph. des A. B.* 1840-41. Hitzig, *Kl. Proph.* 3rd ed. 1863; ib. *Daniel*, 1850; ib. *Jeremia*, 2nd ed. 1866. Dillmann, *Buch Henoch*, 1853. Hilgenfeld, *Jüdische Apokalyptik*, 1857. Volkmar, *Prophet Esra*, 1863. Oehler, *Messias* (Herzog), 1858. Herzfeld, III. pp. 311 sqq. Biedermann, *Die Propheten A. B.* 1860. Langen, l. c.

parted glory of former prosperity furnished the groundwork, times of need wove in their tragic threads, times of sorrow gave rise to the most urgent demand for the realization of the picture; nay, the eye was painfully strained to behold what the heart had so warmly cherished, what men's minds had so long and so sublimely pictured, that it was scarcely possible for outward, coarse, material fact to satisfy the anticipation. The finest part of the Old Testament literature—the prophetic—was born together with this most beautiful offspring of the national spirit of Israel. It is impossible for us here to reproduce the splendid figures in which Israel tells of her suffering and her love, and, while becoming ever purer and ever more spiritual by wrestling with herself and with her God, gives expression to the conception of a kingdom of righteousness and holiness extending from Zion outwards over the whole world. We are able here scarcely to follow even in roughest outline the general development of these anticipations; the completer details of their individual features we reserve for the life of him who was to convert the ideal into an accomplished fact.

In the separation of the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel (B.C. 975), in the decline of Israel, and in the decay of Judah under David's posterity, there sprang up, and, from the ninth century, from the times of the prophets Amos and Hosea, and then in the eighth century, in the times of Isaiah and Micah, there grew continually stronger, the hope that God would raise up once more "the fallen tabernacle of David;" that He would plant upon Zion a branch from the stem of Jesse which had been cut down, from the top of the high cedar which had been broken off; that out of Bethlehem, out of the house of David, the king of Israel, there should come forth, adorned with the name of God and with the mysterious title of eternal, a gatherer together of the people, a conqueror of the Gentiles, the world's prince of peace, the planter of knowledge and righteousness.[1] At the

[1] Amos ix. 11; Hosea iii. 5; Isaiah ix. 6 sqq., xi. 1 sqq; Micah iv. 1 sqq., v. 1 sqq.

beginning of the Asiatic captivity, of the end of all hope (B.C. 588), Jeremiah and Ezekiel persisted in the assertion that in the seed of David, in the righteous branch, the redemption of the nation was at hand.[1] The long exile, the weakness of the colony that returned to the land of their fathers under the Persian king Cyrus (B.C. 536), the decayed condition of the family of David, which with difficulty asserted itself in Zerubbabel, weakened faith in the old royal house, but not faith in the future of Israel. Under the Persian king Darius (B.C. 520—518), Zechariah loudly complains, O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt Thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah, against which Thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years? And he proclaims Joshua, the high-priest, and Zerubbabel, the descendant of David, to be the two sons of oil, the anointed, the crowned, which stand before the Ruler of the world types and pledges of the coming perfect priesthood and royalty in the approaching "branch" of David.[2] Somewhat later, indeed (cir. B.C. 430), under the experiences of a Persian satrapy and in the midst of many impurities, both of the people and the priests, faith in the house of David disappears in Malachi, the last prophet; but the Lord himself will come to execute judgment, to inhabit His temple, to establish His covenant and His kingdom, and will have as His forerunner the prophet promised by Moses (Deut. xviii. 15), the heavenly Elijah, the man of incomparable power, an establisher of peace, a preparer of Israel for the coming of the great King.[3]

After a long and dreary pause, the spirits of the nation revived with the war for religious freedom against Syria. In the

[1] Jeremiah xxiii. 5 sqq., xxxiii. 14 sqq; Ezekiel xxxiv. 23, xxxvii. 24.

[2] Zechariah i. 12, iii. 1 sqq., iv. 1 sqq., vi. 11 sqq. Comp. Hitzig, *Die zwölf kl. Propheten*, 3rd ed. 1863, pp. 326 sqq.

[3] Comp. Mal. i. 6, 8, 14, iii. 1 sqq., iv. 5 sqq. Hitzig, l. c. pp. 395 sqq. He fixes the date between B.C. 433—358. The desired angel of the covenant in iii. 1 is mysterious; perhaps *malach Jahve*, the appearing God (comp. Oehler, p. 416). Hitzig: messenger of purification (*Borit*) = Elijah. But the two ἄγγελοι appear as separate persons.

dawn of this period (cir. B.C. 167), the prophetic book of Daniel proclaimed, without giving prominence to any individual, the kingdom of the holy God from heaven, the kingdom of the pious nation, which by God's grace should overcome the great empires, even those that were of iron. Half a century later (cir. B.C. 110), the earliest Book of Enoch exhibits, in the person of the Asmonæan John Hyrcanus—"the great horn"—the divinely ordained conqueror as the leader of the flock of young horned lambs; and beyond him, a yet greater future, when the Messiah, the white great-horned bull, should be born and, while the congregation was assembled together in power and judgment around the new temple of God, should be transformed into his patriarchal greatness.[1] The nation rested for some time in this new Asmonæan prosperity. Simon, the Asmonæan, from whose first year (B.C. 143) the time of freedom was dated, is with pride called, in all the records, the high-priest and commander and prince of the Jews, and he was to be ever so called until the true prophet foretold by Moses should arise. The then present time seemed to approach so nearly to the ideal, that the house of David was superfluous, and the people were quite willing to await the prophetic restorer of religion, if in the ever-advancing deification of the outward law such a restorer were needed.[2] The latter

[1] Daniel ii. 31 sqq., vii. 13 sqq. Ewald, IV. pp. 394 sqq. Hitzig, *Comm. zu Daniel*, is fully justified in identifying the *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* with *ἅγιοι ὑψίστου*: thus Daniel interprets himself throughout. Comp. the similar representation in the *Ascension of Moses*, ed. Ceriani, *Monum.* 5, 1861, pp. 59 sq.: Israel translated to heaven, among the stars, his foes at his feet. But it is quite intelligible that from a very early date (comp. Enoch) the personification was taken to be a person; and Daniel, in particular, elsewhere speaks of an anointed (Mashiach), ix. 25 sq. Yet comp. Oehler. The Book of Enoch (translated and explained by A. Dillmann), cap. 90. Also Dillmann's Commentary. In the text above, I have taken as my basis the view of Dillmann, also of Hilgenfeld (*Apokalyptik*, pp. 93 sqq.) and Oehler (article *Messias*, in Herzog, IX. p. 427), as to the age of the book and especially of this section; whilst I, with Hilgenfeld and Oehler, consider the capp. 37—71 (with the idea of the Son of Man, &c.) to be later and Christianized.

[2] 1 Macc. xiii. 42, iv. 46, xiv. 41: *ἕως τοῦ ἀναστῆναι προφήτην πιστόν*. The passage ii. 57, no evidence of Davidic expectations. The Maccabæan watchwords, *θεοῦ βοήθεια, νίκη*, 2 Macc. viii. 23, xiii. 15. Comp. the interesting notice in *Pseudophil.*

seemed to be unnecessary under John Hyrcanus, whom Josephus called the happiest of men, whose success silenced every murmur against fate, and who alone possessed the three greatest things, —dominion over the people, the high-priesthood, and the office of prophet, and who enjoyed such intimate intercourse with the Deity that nothing future was hidden from him.[1]

His death, however, destroyed the hopeful vision of happiness; and, after the weaklings of the Asmonæans, came Rome and Herod. When the heroes have fallen, and power disappears from the community, the ancient Davidic ideal revives. Neither the name of David nor his posterity had ever completely been lost sight of. The Book of Sirach was written in Palestine before the Asmonæan struggle, about B.C. 180—170, but it was not until about B.C. 130 that it was translated in Egypt into Greek, as we now have it. This book of bald morality exhibits weak, vacillating, fluctuating opinions; but while it seeks in all directions for some one in whom to anchor hope—Abraham, the Patriarchs, the Elijah of Malachi, the high-priest of Zechariah, in whom it sees Simon the Just (B.C. 220)—it significantly mentions David also, whose horn God will exalt for ever, and to whom a root yet remains.[2] About the same time, under Ptolemy Physcon (cir. B.C. 140), the so-called Jewish sibyl appeared in Egypt, and proclaimed—in the third, the oldest and most important of the Sibylline books—the man of the future, who should spring from the seed of David:

breviar. (Herzfeld, I. p. 379): Mox secuti Asmonæi simul cum pontificatu etiam ducatum a domo David subripuerunt. Thus, as late as the Asmonæans, the house of David, in the persons of Joseph and Hyrcanus (see above, p. 277; comp. 2 Macc. iii. 11), held a high position, which it lost through—among other things—the Hellenizing tendency of its leaders, and through the Asmonæans.

[1] *B. J.* 1, 2, 8.

[2] Sirach xliv. 21 sqq., xlvii. 11 (13), 22 (25), xlviii. 10, l. 1 sqq. Yet comp. Oehler, article *Messias*, in Herzog. IX. p. 423. Also Sirach xlvii. 22 I hold to be not unimportant. The date of Simon the Just, I place—with Herzfeld, II. p. 377, and Jost (1857), I. p. 110—under Antiochus the Great.

"There is a royal race whose generation shall never
Cease to exist on the earth, but shall in the process of ages
Sit on a throne, and anew begin to build up the temple."[1]

Through the whole of the third book, down to the time of Antonius and Augustus, men's eyes are directed towards the eternal holy kingdom of the future. This anticipation is continued, without interruption, in the so-called Psalter of Solomon, which appeared in Palestine at the beginning of the Roman and Idumæan era, under king Herod: this book—which was unknown until a recent date (A.D. 1615)—was originally written in Hebrew, and contains the ardent appeal to God: Behold, O Lord, and raise up for them their king, David's son, in the time which thou hast appointed, that he may rule over Israel thy servant.[2]

From the Psalter of Solomon we step immediately into the times of Jesus. The distresses of the Roman-Idumæan rule gathered in ever-thickening clouds over the nation that felt the Syrian times were come again. What book was studied more intently than that charter of future consolation, the prophet Daniel? Containing less of vengeance than of promise, defining the future with exactness, supported by the verification of its assumptions—for the author had but veiled his experience under

[1] *Die sibyll. Weissag. vollständig gesammelt*, by Friedlieb, 1852, pp. 3, 286 sqq.; 3, 46 sqq., 652 sqq. Comp. Hilgenfeld, pp. 64 sqq., 81 sqq. I hold with him, as to 3, 286 sqq., contrary to the general opinion (including Oehler, p. 429), that the reference to Cyrus and Zerubbabel is not fully established. Comp. also Volkmar, *Esra*, p. 396.

[2] *Psalterium Salomonis*, in Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr. V. T.* I. pp. 914 sqq. Comp. 17, 5, 23. Ewald (*Gesch. Volks. Isr.* 3rd ed. IV. p. 392), and with him Dillmann (article *Pseudepigraphen A. T.* Herzog, XII. p. 305; also Oehler, p. 426), are in favour of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Movers, *Kath. Kirchenlexikon*, I. p. 340; Delitzsch, *Comm. Psalmen D.* 1860, II. p. 381; and recently Langen, *Judenth. in Pal.* 1866, pp. 64 sqq., with much better ground are in favour of the Roman times (comp. only 2, 1; 8, 18, sqq.; 17, 14: ἕως ἐπὶ δυσμῶν; also description of the Sadducees, 4, 1); and the two former again correctly bring the date down to Herod's time, while Langen thinks of Pompey's days (B.C. 63). There is perhaps an allusion to Pompey, but plainly also to the fierce tyrant against the Sanhedrim (8, 18 sqq.) Grätz (as often in other cases, comp. Philo) assumed the author to have been a Christian, which, in the face of 17, 33—51, and 18, 6—10, is scarcely possible (Langen), and is simply an inconsiderate assumption.

a prophetic disguise—it became the proud expression of the national belief, and the barometer of the expectation which was feverishly intensified by the demoniacal tyranny of the powers of the world. The book of Daniel, repeatedly mentioned in the Gospels and by Jesus himself, and the divine utterance on which the people relied in their last struggle of despair against Rome, spoke clearly of four kingdoms of the earth, the fourth strong as iron, with great iron teeth and brazen claws, devouring and treading down everything, and at last itself suddenly trodden down by the kingdom of the saints from heaven: what was this —in the light of the time that followed the Macedonian and the Greek rule—but the iron Roman empire, overthrown by the kingdom of heaven?[1] In fact, the times of Jesus are full of a restless expectation of the salvation which was to come. A weak party of non-religious Jews were willing to see their ideal in Herod, who called himself the bringer of happiness to Israel.[2] Others clung with convulsive hope to the last remnants of the Asmonæan house, to Hyrcanus, to the youthful and handsome high-priest Aristobulus, to the false Alexander, who pretended to be the murdered yet still living son of Mariamne, and whom, after the king's death, all foreign Jews even as far as Rome acknowledged, until the emperor Augustus freed them from faith in an impostor; and, finally, the nation clung to Agrippa I., the grandson, the new king of the Jews under Caligula, and whom Alexandria and Jerusalem, amid the envy of the foreigners, hailed with joyful surprise as their star of hope. Others, again, "in the frenzy of despair," found the saviours of Israel in the military leaders who, immediately after the king's death, sprang up like fungi, and overran Judæa and Galilee, partly as disciples of the great adventurer, and partly as speculators in the popular anticipation of the Messiah; while others flocked to the banner

[1] Dan. ii., vii. A favourite book, *Ant.* 10, 11, 7. Its importance in the Jewish war, *B. J.* 6, 5, 4.

[2] Tert. *Præscr.* 45: Herodiani, qui *Christum Herodem* esse dixerunt. Comp. above, pp. 234 sqq.

of Judas the Galilean, who, in the name of God, began the armed vindication of the freedom of the people of God, and who was the forerunner of all the defenders of freedom, the impostors, prophets, and Messiahs, which rose against Rome, from the reign of Tiberius to the reigns of Nero and Hadrian. At the same time, the Scribes and Pharisees—fellow-believers of the Galileans—diffused, with cunning foresight, but also under the influence of a suppressed belief in fate, the doctrine that the divine rule was bound up with no Messiah, but was compatible with a distant Roman governor of Syria.[1] The unhappy nation wrestled feverishly for its salvation in a hundred ways, seeking to create or to bring near the promised time; and it was not until all the efforts of human arms had miscarried, that it once more came to itself, and—as Philo said to Caligula—recognized the God of Israel as stronger than man.[2] Thus is explained the fact that the old prophetic watchwords—the Messiah-Christ, the kingdom of the great king, the kingdom of heaven, the throne and seed of David—formulated and scattered among the people by the later books of Daniel, Enoch, the Sibylline writings, the Psalms of Solomon, and the Targums, were, in the days of John the Baptist and of Jesus, on every man's lips in Judæa and Galilee and even in Samaria,—the people and the Pharisees using them with reference to a son of David who should be a political king and commander, while John and Jesus and their adherents used them with reference to a spiritual saviour.[3] For

[1] The details are given above, in the historical sketch. Concerning the false Alexander, see *Ant.* 17, 12. Agrippa, Philo, *In Flacc.* pp. 969 sqq.; Jos. *Ant.* 18, 6, 11, and 8, 2; Acts xii. 22. Concerning the Pharisees, see below.

[2] Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* p. 1020. Comp. the watchword of the Maccabees above, p. 317, note 2.

[3] Comp. *Mashiach, Meshicha* (anointed, Messiah, Christ), Ps. ii. 2; Dan. ix. 25 sq.; *Salom. Ps.* 17, 36; *Ant.* 18, 6, 8 (perhaps Christian). The Targums, Gen. xlix. 10; Num. xxiv. 17 sqq. Often in Jonathan, *e.g.* Isaiah ix. 6. Langen, pp. 419 sqq. Oehler, p. 434. Kingdom of heaven, from Dan. ii., vii. (so also Lightfoot, Bertholdt, De Wette), in Targum of Jonathan (*malchut Jahve*), Micah iv. 6 sqq.; Isaiah xl. 9, liii. 10 sq. Comp. Lightfoot on Matt. iii. 3. De Wette, *Bibl. Dogm.* 3rd ed. p. 176. *Sibyll.* 3, 47 sqq.: *βασιλεία μεγίστη ἀθανάτου βασιλῆος ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισι φανεῖται. Ib.* 766: *καὶ τότε δ' ἐξεγερεῖ βασιλήϊον εἰς αἰῶνας πάντας ἐπ'*

the same watchwords were made to express the different needs of different individuals.

It is altogether contrary to history to believe that the Messianic belief in general, and the belief in a Davidic Messiah in particular, had declined in the time of Jesus. The Gospels alone afford a confutation of the opinion which (among both Christians and Jews) seems to be based on the assumption that Jesus was an enthusiast full of fantastic expectations,—expectations which the moderate and cultivated Hillel, the true reformer, had rejected with contempt. Rather was the representative of the Messianic belief the representative of all the ancient, great, and holy ideals, as well as of all the new, living, burning, moving aspirations of the people. The Hellenistic, Alexandrian illumination shows, in the most telling manner, how firm a hold of the age this belief possessed. That illumination had, on the one hand, fused the ideal of the historical Messiah into the abstract metaphysical idea of angels, and powers, and the Logos. The Septuagint had already thus interpreted many prophetic passages, and Philo referred Zechariah's prediction of the branch of David to the Logos.[1] And yet, notwithstanding a strong volitalizing tendency, the Sibylline writings, springing from the same soil, held fast to the Messiah; the Septuagint again and again, with a different reading from that of the Hebrew text, spoke of a future man of salvation, of a beholding the salvation of God; and the Targumists, imbued with Alexandrian ideas, inserted into the principal passages of the Old Testament the name of

ἀνθρώπους. *Psalm. Sal.* 17, 4, &c.: *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.* Comp. Judas the Galilean. The king and commander to some extent even in Philo and in the Revelation, and especially in the account of the Jewish Messianic expectation in *Philos.* 9, 30: *βασιλεὺς, ἀνὴρ πολεμιστὴς καὶ δυνατὸς*, who falls in the war which then comes to an end. Yet he is *also* high-priest. Further details when we speak of John (when we will also refer to the Samaritans) and of Jesus. Comp. Lightfoot on Matt. vi. 10: Ista oratio, in qua non est memoria regni Dei, non est oratio.—Non oblitus sum memorare nomen tuum et regnum tuum. The prayer (*Kaddish*) after the exile: Regnet tuum regnum; redemtio mox veniat.

[1] Isaiah ix. 6 (LXX.): *μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος*. Further, Ps. cx. 3 (cix. 3). Zech. vi. 12 referred by Philo (*De conf. ling.*) to the Logos; comp. Langen, pp. 396, 400. Oehler, p. 426.

the Messiah, the king and teacher, the kingdom of heaven, of the future and of consolation.[1] Philo himself retained a remnant of the Messianic belief, notwithstanding all he had done to diminish and to spiritualize it by means of his serviceable instrument, the idea of the Logos, and notwithstanding all his shyness with reference to the book of Daniel. When Israel, in the time of need, recognizes, repents of, and confesses her sins, then shall all who are scattered abroad even to the ends of the earth be set free in one day as if by a word of deliverance; and their masters, amazed at the unanimous elevation of character, shall be ashamed to rule over those who are better than themselves. In a common glow of fervour, and led by a supernatural, divine Form, visible only to the redeemed, they shall proceed to the place pointed out to them, rejoicing in three intercessors for reconciliation with the Father,—the forgiving goodness of the Father himself, the prayer of the patriarchs, and, above all, that moral conversion by which they have become true sons. When they arrive, the destroyed cities shall rise once more, the deserts shall be inhabited, and the unfruitful shall become fruitful. Amid the streams of divine favour, the children shall suddenly become incomparably richer and more prosperous than their forefathers. The national prosperity shall no longer be regarded with envy; the enemies shall no longer wage war against the commander promised by the oracles; nay, the nation shall rule without opposition and to the happiness of its subjects; strength, nobility, and beneficence, the begetters of fear, shame, and goodwill, shall be the supports of its rule.[2] Finally, we must not

[1] Num. xxiv. 7, 17 (ἐξελεύσεται, ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος). Gen. xlix. 10: οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἄρχων ἐκ Ιούδα, κ. τ. λ. Isaiah xxxviii. 11 (LXX.), in Langen, p. 397. The Targumists with *Meshicha*, Gen. xlix. 10; Num. xxiv. 17 sqq. Jonathan, Isaiah ix. 6. The same, 2 Sam. xxiii. 3: days of consolation. Langen, pp. 418 sqq. Oehler, p. 437.

[2] *De præm.* pp. 924 sq.; *De execrat.* pp. 936: ξεναγούμενοι πρός τινος θειοτέρας ἢ κατὰ φύσιν ἀνθρωπίνην ὄψεως. P. 925: ἐξελεύσεται ἄνθρωπος φησὶν ὁ χρησμός, καὶ στραταρχῶν καὶ πολεμῶν. He undoubtedly thinks of the supernatural appearance only as a kind of divine cloud-image, a divine Shechina. Comp. also Oehler and Langen. He has made as good as no use of Daniel or Ezekiel. Ewald, IV. p. 252.

forget Josephus, the rationalist, the deserter to the Roman party. He admits, with more or less frankness, the Messianic hopes of his people as well as of many philosophers, at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem; only he refers (in radical opposition to the text, but with a view to his own life and welfare—accommodating himself to facts, like the moderns) the old "oracles" of a universal ruler out of Israel, to Rome, and to Vespasian, who rose over the ruins of Jerusalem to the imperial throne. He even had the boldness to predict, as a prophet in the name of God, the greatness of the hostile commander. Yet he secretly retained his Jewish faith. When explaining the oracles of Balaam, he appears to leave nothing as the enduring kernel of the prediction except the everlasting possession of the land by the Jews, the chosen people of God dispossessed not even by Rome, and the glorious diffusion of Judaism throughout the world (the "Star" of the prediction). But this is not enough for him: he adds that they shall live in the fulness of peace and prosperity, and in war shall obtain victory and power over even those who have been wont to return home victorious. Here and elsewhere, he looked beyond the Romans; for the present, success belonged to Rome, and the God who grants dominion to the nations in turn, then stood on the side of Italy; but the infallible prophet Daniel had predicted a future salvation, a prediction which had secured for him beyond all others the perpetual sympathy of the people, and which, pointing beyond the destruction by the Romans, was a message of gladness to the nation, in contrast with the predictions of others who were prophets of woe. Though he did not openly apply to Israel the stone which, in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, was cut out of the mountain, and which shattered the image that symbolized the universal monarchies of East and West, and grew to a gigantic size till it filled the earth,—though he avoided the application of this prophecy by taking refuge in the mean subterfuge that he was the historian of the past, and that the book of Daniel being in the Holy Scriptures was accessible to every reader, yet in his heart

he applied the passage to Israel, if not precisely to the Messiah, as Jesus himself did.

It is not necessary here to follow further downwards the Messianic expectations, as they are found in the ascension of Moses, and in the fourth book of Esdras, the composition of which, according to the most probable calculations of Ewald, Gfrörer, Volkmar, and others, dates from the time of Titus, Domitian, or even Nerva (A.D. 96), and not, as Hilgenfeld and others suppose, from the time of Herod the Great. However far the Messianic belief of the fourth book of Esdras may be genuinely Jewish, yet that book, notwithstanding its expectation of a personal Messiah, contains, as the following history will show, traces of Christian influence.[1] The belief in a Davidic Messiah can be followed for centuries in the West, and in the East as far as Babylon, where a descendant of David (as chief of the exile, Rosh Hagolah) stood at the head of the Jews; in like manner as (so it seems) was the case in Jerusalem before the time of the Asmonæans.[2] But it is noteworthy that the Messianic belief of Israel had already begun to spread through the world. In some cases, it would excite alarm or amuse the curious; in others, it would, with its promises of blessing to all the world, satisfy aspirations which even Rome and the first emperor's reign of peace had failed to satisfy. The hope of a dawning golden age after the storms of civil war, easily allied itself with the Jewish expectation of the future. The poets of the Augustan age—besides Virgil, we would especially mention Horace—are full of such anticipations. Virgil in his fourth eclogue quotes the sibyl, and it has often been supposed that he has made use of the Jewish sibyl; and from ancient times until Langen, he has

[1] Comp. especially Volkmar, *Handbuch der Einl. in die Apok.*, 2nd part, the fourth book of Esdras, 1863. Hilgenfeld, *Jüd. Apokalyptik*, 1857, pp. 187 sqq.; *Die Proph. Esra und Daniel*, 1863. The ascension of Moses falls, in any case, after the destruction of Jerusalem, comp. Langen, l. c., p. 110.

[2] Comp. *Philos.* 9, 30; see above, p. 322. The Rabbis, in Lightfoot, pp. 257 sqq. Bertholdt, *Christolog. Jud.* 1811, pp. 75 sqq. Comp. Oehler. The descendants of David in Babylon, see Herzfeld, I. p. 379, II. p. 396. Comp. above p. 318.

been thought to have introduced even the expectation of a virgin's son. This latter is absurd, though that Virgil had come into contact with Jewish descriptions of a golden future is at least possible.[1] Again, the strong attraction of the East for many emperors is striking. Caligula, towards the end of his reign (A.D. 40), felt a restless longing to go to the East; and it was with him an object aimed at and a point of honour personally to establish the worship of himself in Jerusalem. Nero's "secret imaginations" went, from the year 64, towards the provinces of the East. The soothsayers had long since announced to him his loss of the throne, but many consoled him with the dominion of the East, indeed with the kingdom of Jerusalem. One thinks involuntarily of his wife Sabina Poppæa (A.D. 62—65), the ardent Jewish proselyte, the friend of the people of Jerusalem and of Josephus, the mother of the "divine child," but also the supposed accomplice in the frightful persecution of the Roman Christians in the year 64.[2] Immediately afterwards, at the time of the Jewish war (A.D. 66—70), especially in the year 69, the East was full of the prediction which has left its mark on our Gospels in the form of the worshipping Magi, viz. that the rulers of the world should arise out of Judæa. Vespasian and Titus joyfully accepted, at the hands of the Jewish God speaking through Josephus, the promise of their greatness. The rumours of the coming again of Nero out of the East, spreading alarm in the year 69 throughout Greece and Rome, hand in hand with the idea of the universal ruler also

[1] *Eclog.* 4, 4 (to Pollio). Ewald and Friedlieb believe in a more or less immediate dependence on a Jewish source; but Reuss (article *Sibyll.* Herzog.) doubts the existence of any such dependence. Langen (pp. 173 sqq.), however, seriously takes the *virgo* (verse 6: jam redit et virgo), as referring to a birth from a virgin = Isaiah vii. 14, and *Sibyll.* 3, 784 sqq. (εὐφράνθητι κόρη). Why not also 3, 75? Comp. Eus. *Or. Const. ad s. coet.* 18, 19. But Langen could have learnt from Heyne and recent writers that the *virgo* = *Dike*.

[2] *Ann.* 15, 36. Suet. *Nero*, 40: Spoponderant quidam destituto Orientis dominationem, nonnulli nominatim regnum Hierosolymorum. Poppæa, Tac. *Ann.* 13, 45 sq.; 14, 1, 59 sqq.; 15, 23 (divine daughter); 16, 6: Quod divinæ infantis parens fuisset. Jos. *Vita*, 3; *Ant.* 20, 8, 11: θεοσεβὴς γὰρ ἦν (comp. Tac. *Ann.* 16, 6).

out of the East, owed a part of their force to the Jewish Messianic belief; and, on the other hand, aided Judaism and Christianity to construct the Antichrist out of the characters of Caligula and Nero.[1] These facts are only imperfectly explained, when no other explanation is sought than what is found in Josephus or in the Revelation of John. They were speculations with which heathenism had been inoculated by the energy of belief and steadfastness of confession of the scattered people of God. The fame of the Messiah preceded him in a legendary form: when the Messiah appeared in person he was already familiar to the minds of the people.

Fourth Section.—The Religious Communities in the Holy Land.

I.—*The Pharisees and the Sadducees.*

The religious life of the nation, of which we have given a brief sketch, was itself further divided into a series of characteristic individual forms. Thousands of the higher classes, as well as of the citizens and peasants, belonged to distinct religious societies. In this way, the national spirit gave expression to the whole of its rich subjectivity in a vigorous, manifold, and sharply defined individuality, which, flowing through numerous schools and hundreds of synagogues, passed into the national life, and ultimately collected itself, out of this multitudinous, seething diversity, into the higher and comprehensive unity. Thus the religious communities were flower and fruit in one, and yet again were root and stem of the collective spiritual life. They were altogether a new thing in Israel, whose religious activity

[1] Suet. *Vesp.* 4 : Percrebuerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judæa profecti rerum potirentur. Only of Tacitus (*Hist.* 5, 13) can we believe (contrary to Gieseler, *K. G.* I. p. 51) that he had Jos. *B. J.* 6, 5, 4, before his eyes. Concerning Vespasian, comp. above on Josephus, and my article, *Vespasian*, in Herzog. This is not the place to go further into the question of the Nero legend.

had never, in earlier days, thus organized itself. They proved the existence of crying needs, of gnawing cares, in this spiritual life, and even of a serious breach with the old, of an unsatisfied longing for more than the old could afford; and they proved at the same time the very reverse of that despondent poverty and helpless seeking for redemption which a one-sided mode of looking at religion and an unreal view of history have—under the loud and emphatic contradiction of the records of the period—ascribed to these times of transition. The keen sorrow of the age was indeed a sign of life; and the spiritedly far-grasping, struggling endeavour contradicts the assumption of national exhaustion, and is an indication of an unconsumed capital.[1]

The religious societies of this later Judaism have often been called sects. By this word, the term used by the Jewish historian, who applied to Jewish affairs a nomenclature borrowed from the Greek schools of philosophy, is as to the letter not altogether incorrectly, but as to fact falsely, translated. These "heresies" are no more sects than were the Greek schools, but parties without any secondary idea of a separation from the general life of the nation,—which separation Pharisaism distinctly repudiated.[2] The word heresy, in the sense of sect, can scarcely be applied even to the Jewish party of the Essenes, which more than any other possessed the characteristic of exclusiveness. On the other hand, the Pharisees and Sadducees stood completely within the national community, and were indeed its spiritual leaders.[3]

[1] Comp. the remarkable passage, Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* p. 1023, partly given above, p. 233.

[2] Jos. *Con. Ap.* 2, 23.

[3] Besides the expression *αἱρέσεις*, Josephus has also *τάγματα*, *συντάγματα* (confederacies), *B. J.* 1, 5, 2; 2, 8, 14; *μόριον*, *Ant.* 17, 2, 4. Detailed notices in Jos. *B. J.* 2, 8; *Ant.* 13, 5, 9; 13, 10, 5, 6; 17, 2, 4; 18, 1, 2 sqq. Also (after Josephus) *Philos.* 9, 18—29. Porph. *De abst.* 4, 11. Among moderns, see Ewald, IV. pp. 358 sqq., Grätz, Geiger, Herzfeld, Reuss, Biedermann, *Phar. u. Sadd.* 1854. Kleinert, *Jesus im Verhältniss zu den Parteien*, is comparatively worthless.

1.—The Pharisees.

Among these parties, Pharisaism holds the first place in time, importance, and influence. Indeed, its position in the nation became so preponderant, that the name of party appears to be a far too narrow designation. Although at the time of Jesus it was represented by an exclusive association of only 6000 men, it appealed to the nation, and the masses of the people listened to this appeal, before which the Asmonæan princes themselves, and even Herod and the Romans, had cause to tremble. The second party, that of the Sadducees, can be fully understood—as Josephus has frequently pointed out—only as the product of the opposition evoked by the powerful phenomenon of Pharisaism, the opposition in contact with the Pharisaic restraints intensifying into a party,—into such a party indeed as could successfully make use of scoffing when restraints were weakened by the excitement of the times.

The Pharisees, with their opponents, are mentioned for the first time under Jonathan, the second Asmonæan (B.C. 161—143). About this time flourished the first distinct leaders of the party, Joses ben Joezer and Joses ben Jochanan. Kindred national-religious aims and endeavours made them partizans and patrons of the Asmonæans: hence their powerful influence under John Hyrcanus, the last great Asmonæan (B.C. 135—107). Their growing arrogance, which required the prince to limit his jurisdiction to the governing of the people, and to lay down his office of high-priest because of the ceremonial uncleanness of his mother through captivity in Syria, drove the prince—not without the rebellion of Pharisaic Jerusalem—into the camp of the Sadducees, who were masters of the position until the end of the reign of Alexander Jannæus (B.C. 105—79). But when dying, the king advised his widow Alexandra—who was already devoted to the party, and to their leader Simon ben Shetah—to favour the Pharisees, who were all-powerful among the people. Everything, even the proscription of their enemies, was per-

mitted to them afresh by Alexandra, and still more by her weak-minded son Hyrcanus. Simon is said to have expelled the Sadducees from the Sanhedrim. The abuse of their power by the Pharisees helped to bring about a new reaction, the conflicts of the brothers Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, the entry of the Romans, and the rule of the Idumæans. But the Pharisees, murmuring, unyielding, and at last victorious, survived also the long tyranny of Herod, under whose reign they numbered over 6000 men. With the fall of his kingdom, they passed into bondage to Rome; but they acquired at the same time complete possession of all the spiritual forces of the nation,—the earnest of ultimate deliverance by God, or, under false guidance, of ruin.[1]

Though these external circumstances might lead us to regard Pharisaism as before all things a political party, it must be remembered that on such a soil only religious motive could exercise any strong influence. In fact, the name of the party has a religious significance. The Pharisees (*Perushim*, Aram. *Perishin*) are the separated, the holy, the pure. The name has a meaning somewhat similar to that of the Nazarites. The name carries us further back in Jewish history than Josephus; for we find the separated (Nibdalim) and the pure as opposed to the lax and to the Gentile-favouring mixed population, as early as at the beginning of the community of returned exiles, and again at the beginning of the Greek era. These purists are essentially those who are punctilious observers of the Law of their fathers; hence they stand in as close relation to the strict, wise teachers of the Law, the Sopherim, Chachamim, of whom Ezra was the first, as with the law-observing "Pious," the Chasidim of the Syrian time, who in the name of God had recourse to the

[1] The *first* party also as to time, πρώτην ἐπάγοντες αἵρεσιν, *B. J.* 2, 8, 14 (Sadd. *ib.*: τὸ δεύτερον τάγμα). The first mention, *Ant.* 13, 5, 9. The two Joses, in Jost, 1857, p. 199. John Hyrcanus, *Ant.* 13, 10, 6. Alex. Jannæus (*Iannai*, Greek *Ianneas*), *ib.* 13, 15, 5; *B. J.* 1, 5, 2. Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, *Ant.* 13, 16, 1—5. Number, *Ant.* 17, 2, 4. Simon ben Shetach, in Herzfeld, III. 365. The Pharisees immediately instrumental in the ruin of the nation, *B. J.* 2, 17, 3; 6, 5, 4.

sword against those who would corrupt the true religion. In the Pharisees we find a change of name, but not of thing, when we regard the matter from the standpoint of organic history: they are the legally pious and Gentile-opposing national party. That the name was invented by their opponents, the Sadducees (Herzfeld), is, according to the foregoing remarks, improbable.[1]

This party is, as a whole, the outcome of the necessities and resolves of the Jewish colony that settled among the ruins of Jerusalem. In the infinite misery of the exile, the dullest eye had seen and apprehended in His awful majesty the God of Israel, the mighty and the just, whom Moses and the prophets —the lights of the nation—had been able to bring the sensual people to acknowledge, only by incessant and painful effort. Through the bitter realities of history had He and His holy, despised ordinances become part of the flesh and blood of the nation. The appeal to the Law was heard afresh. The book of the Law must be learnt anew; it must be learnt more thoroughly than their fathers had learnt it, for mountains of doctrine hung upon every point in the book of the great God. The holy precepts and customs must be speedily re-established upon the holy soil. And since every individual precept was of eternal value, and since the eye was straining to behold again the long absent, visible presence of the priestly kingdom of God in the desolate land, what was more natural than the impetuous effusion of

[1] Clem. *Hom.* 11, 28 : *οἵ εἰσιν ἀφωρισμένοι καὶ τὰ νόμιμα ὡς γραμματεῖς τῶν ἄλλων πλεῖον εἰδότες.* Tertull. *Præscr.* 45 : Pharisæos, qui additamenta quædam legis adstruendo a Judæis *divisi* sunt, unde etiam hoc accipere nomen digni fuerunt. Epiph. *Hær.* 1, 16, 1 : *ἀφωρισμένοι* (*φάρες κατὰ τὴν ἑβραΐδα*). So also Suidas. The Nibdalim, *χωρισθέντες τῆς ακαθαρσίας τῶν ἐθνῶν*, Ezra vi. 21, ix. 1, x. 11 ; Neh. ix. 2, x. 29 ; 1 Macc. i. 11 ; comp. Herzfeld, p. 384. Geiger, *Sadd. u. Pharis.* Bresl. 1863, p. 13. Chasidim, *Ἀσιδαῖοι*, 1 Macc. ii. 42, vii. 13 ; 2 Macc. xiv. 6. The Pharisees themselves are so called = *ὅσιοι*, *Ant.* 19, 7, 4. Also the word *Nazir* (from *nazar*, to separate oneself, to abstain) among the Rabbis = Parush ; comp. Herzfeld, pp. 140, 205. Oehler, article *Nasiräat.* The origin of Pharisaism is similarly described by Reuss, Jost, and Geiger. Ewald ascribes to them too much of the character of "power-seeking pietists," IV. pp. 478, 483, 493, &c.; hence the dissatisfaction with which Jewish historians regard him. Grätz, however, is also beside the mark, III. p. 72.

piety in temple-building, sacrifice, and the thousand toilsome labours of the hands, which the prophets had long before in vain subordinated to the service of a pure heart and life? By means of this severe obedience to the Law (Mal. iii. 14), the people hoped once more to be the people of God—the harder the service, the more would the Divine Heart be moved to raise Israel, His servant, to the glorious position which had been promised.

The work of re-establishing the Law had been undertaken, immediately after the exile, by Ezra the scribe (Sopher), the restorer of the Torah, which Israel had forgotten; and he was aided, according to tradition, by the so-called great synagogue (keneset gedolah), the watchword of which was, Make a hedge about the Law![1] The words of the scribes, the learned in the Scriptures (dibre sopherim), possessed great authority. In this manner the class of lawyers, of those who were learned in the Scriptures, took its rise. Its leaders—"the worthy disciples of Ezra"—who restored the ancient glory to the "crown," the Law, were considered greater than kings, the great ones of the age (gedole hador), as Shemaiah and Abtalion were called. They were exalted above the priests, for they only could declare, The man is pure, and the priest shall pronounce him pure. On one occasion, it is said, on the great day of atonement, as the people were accompanying the high-priest to his house in friendly escort, the great teachers Shemaiah and Abtalion met the procession, and the whole crowd at once turned back with them. It was easy for them to lead the attack even against high-priests and kings. The history of king Herod amply proves this; and even Agrippa the Great, the popular grandson, was met by Simon the scribe with a boldness that exceeded the arrogance of the Pharisee Eleazar against John Hyrcanus. Access to the temple must be forbidden to the king—thus Simon harangued the people of the holy city after Agrippa's departure—because he

[1] *Pirke Abot*, I. 1: Isti (viri synagogæ magnæ) dixerunt tres sententias; estote tardi in judicio. Et constituite discipulos multos. Et *facite sepem legi.*

was not one of the pious, but was a Gentile, a friend of foreign customs and the theatre.[1] From the Syrian time, the scribes were for the most part Pharisees, although Sadducees and neutrals sometimes bore the name. The scribes passed for the most accurate expounders of the Law, and of all questions concerning divine things, sacrifice, and vows. Knowledge of the Law, uprightness, piety, and holiness according to the Law, was their watchword. Hundreds of young men, zealous for the Law, sat at the feet of their most eminent teachers; indeed, the scribes were gladly heard by all who strove after the attainment of virtue; and they themselves appealed to every one, for they promised to *all* the heritage—holiness, the kingdom, the priesthood—and taught that the sacrifices were offered in the name of all, in the name of the nation. They were pious democrats in the sense of the words of the great Hillel: Separate not thyself from the community![2] They promised divine rewards to those who kept the Law; and they taught the consoling doctrine that those who fell in defence of the Law should receive the recompence of eternal life and of ultimate resurrection in a pure body, while the immortality of the wicked should be spent in eternal punishment.[3] An infinite and genuinely Hebrew faith in the divine disposition of all things, nay, in a divine fate, from which only man's power to choose between good and evil was in some

[1] *Ant.* 13, 10, 5; 17, 2, 4; 19, 7, 4. Agrippa's retort to Simon is interesting, as showing us the latter in the theatre: *τί τῶν ἐνθάδε γενομένων ἐστὶ παράνομον*? The evidence for the designations given above, in Jost, Grätz, Herzfeld. The high-priests and the heads of the schools, Jost, I. p. 250.

[2] *Ant.* 17, 2, 4: *μόριον ἐπ' ἀκριβώσει μέγα φρονοῦν τοῦ πατρίου νόμου. B. J.* 2, 8, 14: *οἱ δοκοῦντες μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ νόμιμα. Ant.* 13, 10, 6: *τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν κατασταθέντα νόμιμα τῷ δήμῳ. Ib.* 18, 1, 3: *ὑπόσα θεῖα εὐχῶν τε καὶ ἱερῶν ποιήσεως ἐξηγήσει τῇ ἐκείνων τυγχάνουσι πρασσόμενα. B. J.* 1, 33, 2: *στρατόπεδον τῶν ἡβώντων*, comp. *Ant.* 17, 6, 2. *δικαιοσύνη, τὰ δίκαια, B. J.* 2, 8, 14; *Ant.* 13, 10, 5; 16, 1. Comp. in New Testament, *δικαιοσύνη ἐν νόμῳ* in Paul, who had previously been a Pharisee. Universal priesthood, 2 Macc. ii. 17: *ὁ Θεὸς ὁ σώσας τὸν παντα λαὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ δοὺς τὴν κληρονομίαν πᾶσι καὶ τὸ βασίλειον καὶ τὸ ἱεράτευμα καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμόν.* Geiger notices, p. 26, the Pharisaic spirit of the book. Comp. *Ant.* 18, 1, 3. Hillel, *Pirke Abot*, II. 4: Ne segreges te ab ecclesia.

[3] *B. J.* 2, 8, 14; 3, 8, 5; *Ant.* 18, 1, 3. Comp. below, in the teaching of Jesus, for greater detail concerning the Essenes.

degree excepted, protected them from despair in the face of continued national disaster; alleviated the burden of foreign servitude, since that servitude had come upon them not without God's permission; and confirmed their hope of the ultimate political sovereignty of God, the foretaste of which they enjoyed in the attachment of the people to themselves.[1] Josephus compares them to Stoics, and in many points there was a similarity; but —not to speak of other differences—the heroism of the Stoic aimed only at a deathlike indifference to the world and to fate, while the Pharisee held inflexibly to his faith in his God and in the triumph of his cause in the world.[2]

The success of Pharisaism was promoted by a wonderful discipline. Its exposition of the Law did not exhaust itself in untrustworthy and disconnected minutiæ. Pharisaism was powerfully organized: "Provide for thyself a teacher (rab), and get to thyself a companion (chaber),"—such was Joshua ben Perachiah's injunction with reference to the consolidation of the forces of the party.[3] An undisguised subordination, rather piety and love, regulated the relations of the scholars to their masters, of the later time to that of the ancients, of the teachers, of the wise. Hence the fact that, in the difficult question as to the lawfulness of slaying the Passover lamb on the Sabbath, Hillel, with all the subtlety of his logical proof, could not gain his point until he declared, Thus have I heard it from Shemaiah and Abtalion; and the assembly then appointed him president.[4] Since it was customary to appeal to the great leaders—to Hillel and Shammai in Herod's reign, to Shemaiah and Abtalion in the time of Hyrcanus the high-priest, to Simon ben Shetah and Judas ben Tabbai in the time of Alexander Jannæus, to Joshua

[1] The divine εἱμαρμένη, *B. J.* 2, 8, 13 and 14; *Ant.* 13, 5, 9; 18, 1, 3. According to 18, 1, 3, they considered human action to be the κρᾶσις of human freedom and divine omnipotence. Comp. their determinism in relation to Herod the Great.

[2] Jos. *Vita*, 2.

[3] *Pirke Abot*, I. 6: Fac ut habeas præceptorem et compara tibi socium.

[4] Jost, 1857, pp. 256 sqq. On the origin of the title *Rabbi* (comp. Matt. xxiii. 7), see *ib.* p. 270.

ben Perachiah and Nithai of Arbela in Galilee in the days of John Hyrcanus, further back as far as the second and third centuries before Christ, to the two Joses (B.C. 150), to Antigonus of Socho in Judah (cir. B.C. 200), and to his teacher, Simon the Just, the contemporary of the great Antiochus (B.C. 220), the scion of the "Great Synagogue"—there was brought about, by means of the training of the school, and notwithstanding all differences of opinion upon details—as between Hillel and Shammai—that unanimity for which Josephus so pointedly gives the party credit; in the same way also, an authoritative and venerable character gradually attached itself to the hoary "tradition" which claimed to be the authentic representative of Moses and the prophets, even though, in its wide-swollen stream of knowledge, it had far overstepped the limits of the Mosaic letter.[1] The enthusiastic disciples of this tradition repeatedly boasted that the words of the wise and of the scribes were more to be esteemed than those of the prophets; nay, that they were dearer and more precious than the written Law, the man in comparison with the woman, the oil in comparison with the light. "In the words of the Law there are things weighty and trifling; but the words of the scribes are all weighty." "Therefore, my son, be more careful about the teaching of the Sopherim than about that of the Law." "Let your fear of the Rabbi be like the fear of God." "He who transgresses the word of the Sopherim, throws away his life."[2]

The character of the Pharisaic exposition of the Law was pre-

[1] *B. J.* 2, 8, 14, φιλάλληλοι. *Ant.* 18, 1, 3 (ὁμόνοια). Νόμιμα πολλὰ τινὰ παρέδοσαν τῷ δήμῳ οἱ φ. ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς, ἅπερ οὐκ ἀναγέραπται ἐν τοῖς Μωυσέως νόμοις, comp. Matt. xv. 2, v. 21; Gal. i. 14; *Philosoph.* 9, 28: τὴν ἀρχαίαν παράδοσιν διακρατοῦντες. The ἀρχαῖοι and πρεσβύτεροι (Matt.) = sekenim (Rabb.). Continuity of tradition, *Pirke Ab.* I. 1: Moses accepit legem ex monte Sinai et tradidit eam Jehoschuæ et J. senioribus et s. prophetis, proph. vero tradiderunt eam viris synagogæ magnæ.

[2] Comp. the Rabbis in Leusden, 1665, and Lehmann, *Pirke Abot*, 1684; further in Lightfoot, p. 260, Gfrörer, Grätz, Jost, III. p. 121. Most recently Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums*, 1857, I. p. 93. On the above-mentioned facts is based the public *abrogation* of Mosaic ordinances, *ib.*

ponderantly that of a burdensome and servile restoration. The prophets—the genuine interpreters of Moses—disappeared in the background, even though their writings were publicly read with the Law, their graves adorned with new monuments, and the Messianic expectation and belief in a future world borrowed from them. It was the enormous delusion of the time that the sensuousness of the Mosaic worship—a sensuousness that was imposing to the eye, but the emptiness of which the prophets had formerly threatened with divine punishment—could wring from the vengeance-suspending God the full smile of His grace. Moses, only Moses, was for ever in the mouths of the scribes; what could be more consistent than that the very pearl of the Law—that moral and humane spirit which, according to Philo's correct view, was but grossly incorporated in the sacrificial worship, and which in the prophets had received a joyous spiritual resurrection—should be broken in pieces and trodden down?

Occasional pithy, vigorous, and humane sayings are not wanting in the great scribes; but the utterances of these teachers are for the most part without spirituality or depth, and do not rise above the mediocrity of a Jesus the son of Sirach; while the total want of new ideas and of a comprehensive and liberal culture, such as Philo's, is particularly evident. As in Josephus, the disciple of the Pharisees, so we find in these teachers platitudes and mechanical theories lying side by side with higher ethical and humane conceptions. The Pirke Abot, the sayings of the Fathers, which in later times have often been read in the synagogues, present the finest collection of the teachings of the scribes. The appeal to the Law naturally takes the first place. Much flesh, said Hillel, many worms; much riches, many sorrows; many women, much sorcery; many maidens, many sins; many servants, much theft; much law, much life; many schools, much wisdom. He who has possessed himself of the words of the Law, possesses the life of the coming era. He who does not increase in learning, decreases; he who learns nothing is worthy of death; and he who studies the Law in a base and mercenary

spirit, dies.[1] Joses ben Joezer reminds his disciples that the Law is the teacher of wisdom: Let thine house be the meeting-place of the wise; sprinkle thyself with the dust of their feet, and eagerly drink in their sayings.[2] But, on the other hand, Shemaiah utters a warning against over-estimating the Rabbinic profession: Love handicraft, and hate the vocation of a Rabbi. And yet earlier, Simon the Just insists upon practical piety: The world rests upon three things—upon the Law, upon serving God, and upon the exercise of compassion.[3] Hillel impresses upon a Gentile, as the sum of the Law, What is hateful to thyself do not to thy neighbour—an interpretation of the Law which was at that time so generally current, that we find it in both Jesus and Philo.[4] Hillel holds forth Aaron as a pattern: Be a follower of Aaron, who sought peace, loved men, and led them to the Law.[5] Ill-will towards neighbours is above all condemned: An evil eye, wicked desire, and hatred towards men, bring a man to destruction.[6] On the other hand, Hillel exclaims, Much righteousness, much peace! Joses ben Jochanan says, Let thine house stand open towards the street, and let the poor be the children of thine house. Shammai says, Speak little, do much, and receive all men with a friendly demeanour.[7] Righteousness and just judgment are most emphatically prescribed, with particular reference to the Sadducees. Judge every man according to the scales of justice (Joshua ben Perachiah); judge not thy neighbour until thou standest in his place (Hillel). As judge, do not assume towards the other judges the attitude of advocate; as

[1] *Pirke Ab.* II. 7, I. 13, IV. 5.

[2] *Ib.* I. 4.

[3] *Ib.* I. 2. Shemaiah, Jost, p. 251.

[4] "This is the whole Law, all else is interpretation." Grätz, p. 226; and Jost, 1857, p. 259, who disputes, with justice, the originality of this (current) saying of Hillel's. Comp. Tobit iv. 16: ὃ μισεῖς μηδενὶ ποιήσῃς. Eus. *Præp. ev.* 8, 7, 6: ἄ τις παθεῖν ἐχθαίρει μὴ ποιεῖν αὐτόν (Philo). Matt. vii. 12, xxii. 37 sqq.; Gal. v. 14. Ewald, IV. p. 270.

[5] *Pirke Ab.* I. 12.

[6] Joshua, scholar of Jochanan, the scholar of Hillel, *ib.* II. 11.

[7] *Ib.* II. 7, I. 5, 15.

long as the parties stand before thee, regard them both as transgressors; when they are dismissed, regard them as justified (Judas ben Tabbai).[1] The love of enemies—with reference to oppressors, intercourse with whom is condemned—is more rarely prescribed; rather it appears characteristically as a renunciation of the right of avenging oneself in the name of God. Reckon thyself among the oppressed, and not among the oppressors, says a favourite and beautiful Rabbinical saying; listen to reviling words, and answer not again; do all from the love of God, and rejoice in suffering. But what if the comment of Samuel the Little runs as follows? "When thy friend falls, rejoice not, and when he stumbles, let not thy heart be merry, lest God see it and it be evil in His eye, and He turns His wrath away from him."[2]

One merit in these sayings is the frequent warning against pride, self-righteousness, and confidence. The belief in retribution—that stronghold of the Hebrew national spirit, that fundamental doctrine of Pharisaism—is proclaimed in both sweet and bitter words, and awakens both hope and anxiety. With what measure man metes, it will be measured to him again. In the same pot in which a man has cooked others, will they cook him in return. The mild and gentle Hillel thus addressed a human skull which was floating on the water: Because thou hast drowned others, thou thyself art drowned; and they that have drowned thee, shall themselves also swim.[3] On the one hand, this belief in retribution encouraged the righteousness of works. He who possesses himself of the Law, gains for himself the life of the future æon (Hillel). Know in whose sight thou labourest, and consider that He is the Master of thy work, who will recompense thee with the wages due to thy labour (Eliezer).[4] On the

[1] Joshua, *Pirke Ab.* I. 6; Hillel, *ib.* II. 4. Comp. Jost, pp. 233, 241.

[2] Samuel, *ib.* IV. 19. The former passage, *Shabb.* 88 *b.*; for the rest, comp. Grätz, p. 226. Comp. the saying of Shemaiah: Consort not with those who are high in worldly rank. Jost, p. 251.

[3] *Pirke Ab.* II. 6. The other passages in Lehmann.

[4] *Pirke Ab.* II. 7, 14; comp. 15, 16.

other hand, Hillel gave this warning: The name of him who seeks to make his name great shall pass away; trust not in thyself until the day of thy death, and say not, When I have time I will learn; it may be that thou wilt never have time! If I do not take care for myself, who will? And if I take care only for myself, what am I? And if not now, when? Jochanan, his disciple, said: If thou hast learnt much, pride not thyself upon it, for to that end wast thou created.[1] Antigonus of Socho, as early as cir. B.C. 200, attacked the mercenary spirit: Be not like those servants that serve their masters on condition that they receive wages; but be like those servants that do not serve their masters for the wages' sake; and let the fear of heaven be upon you.[2] Thus are repentance, humility, and a crying for mercy insisted upon: Repent a day before thy death (Eliezer). When thou prayest, let not thy prayer be haughty, but humbly implore the grace of God, as it is said, For He is gracious and merciful, slow to anger and of great goodness, and it repenteth Him to punish (Joel ii. 13); and be not godless in thine own eyes (Simon). Towards the close of the sayings of the Fathers, it is finely said: The man in whom three things are always found, a good eye, a humble spirit, and a lowly soul, is a disciple of Abraham our father.[3] The consoling appellations of Father, applied to God, and of children, applied to men—that seal and confirmation of the gift of grace to the humble—are, however, either altogether absent from this theology, or are found only indistinctly traced, and that especially under Christian influences. The subjectivity of the Christian spirit is ever wanting to the stiff, shy, Jewish conception of God as at a distance. It is a sig-

[1] *Pirke Ab.* I. 13 sq., II. 4, 8. I. 14: Si non ego mihi, quis mihi? et cum ego mihimet ipsi, quid ego? et si non nunc, quando? Wrongly interpreted by Geiger, *Das Judenthum und s. Gesch.* pp. 104 sq.

[2] *Pirke Ab.* I. 3: Ne sitis tanquam servi, qui serviunt magistro ea conditione, ut recipiant mercedem: sed estote tanquam servi, qui serviunt magistro non ea conditione, ut recipiant mercedem sitque timor Dei super vos.

[3] *Ib.* II. 10, 13, V. 19.

nificant fact that for years the Hillelites and the Shammaites disputed over the gloomy and almost heathen query, whether it had not been better if man had never been created; and the assembly of lawyers finally gave an affirmative answer, with the miserable addition: Since, however, man is here, let him be careful in his actions.[1]

But such maxims are laboriously gleaned from a mass of unprofitable discussions concerning external ordinances. The Law of the two tables remained without any worthy exposition. Out of it was constructed—as is seen from the teaching of Jesus, and even from the above-given pithy sentences concerning judicial transactions—in the main a legal system exclusively external, and Philo the Alexandrian has rendered far greater service in this matter than the whole of Pharisaism. The scribes give us no treatises on the mysterious questions of the inner man, the conscience, sin, and sinful desire; no protests against either trifling with oaths and asseverations, or the folly of breaking marriage ties. The moral part of human actions was so completely buried under external works, that sacrifice in the temple—as Jesus crushingly pointed out—relieved the sacrificer from the most elementary commands of filial obedience. This teaching was the most genuine forerunner of the Catholic Christian morality against which Luther fought.[2] In the place of what was lacking, there was a solemn and punctilious attention to trifling matters of ritual. On the day of atonement, should the incense be kindled outside the Holy of Holies, or not rather after the high-priest had entered? This was indeed so weighty a matter,

[1] R. Akiba, III. 14: Dilectus est homo, quia creatus est ad imaginem Dei. Dilecti sunt Israelitæ, ex eo quod vocati sunt *filii* Dei. Judas ben Tema, V. 20: Esto fortis—ad faciendam voluntatem patris tui, qui est in cœlis. Even 4 Esdras has not appropriated this Christian conception,—men are simply the *creaturæ* of God (only *Æth. filii*), VII. 65. Comp. Isaiah lxiii. 16, lxiv. 8; the Book of Wisdom; Philo, see above, p. 293 (yet, after all, everywhere Father only = Creator), and especially in a subsequent volume of this work, Jesus' conception of the Fatherhood of God. The controversy between the two schools, Jost, p. 264.

[2] Matt. v. 20 sqq., xv. 3 sqq.

that the Pharisees required the high-priest, before the day came, to take an oath that he would be punctilious in the performance of his duty. Did the meat-offerings, connected with the bloody sacrifices, belong to the priests, or not rather to the altar? Might the sheaves for the offering of first-fruits on the second day of the Passover be reaped on the Sabbath? Might the Sabbath rest be broken by the slaying of the Passover lamb? At the feast of Tabernacles, must water be poured upon the altar, and might the procession with willow-branches round the altar be omitted? Was it necessary to take tithe of only the corn, oil, and new wine, or must that of anise, cummin, and peppermint, also be taken? Did it avail to swear by heaven and earth, by Jerusalem, by one's own soul, or was it necessary to swear by God? Did it avail to swear by the temple, or only by the gold of the temple? by the altar, or only by the sacrifice on the altar? The treatment of these questions was the more vexatious, because it was seldom regulated by any great moral principle, but was marked merely by uncertain, vacillating acuteness, or even by a casuistic groping among petty details.[1]

This piety was particularly scrupulous as to questions of purity and impurity, questions to which the two Joses first gave special prominence and brought sharply to bear upon heathenism, which was impure and to be avoided.[2] But they did not ask for the pure heart insisted upon by the prophets. On the contrary: Did the flesh only of a carcass defile, or also the hide and the bones? Did contact with Gentile books defile, or only contact with the sacred books of the Gentiles? Was a pure vessel defiled by the water flowing from one that was impure? Is a woman, after seven or fourteen days from the time of her delivery of a son or daughter, clean or unclean? He who undervalues the washing of hands, says the Talmud, shall be rooted out of the

[1] Comp., besides the Rabbis (the disputed questions, especially in Jost, 1857, pp. 217 sqq.; Herzfeld, III. pp. 388 sqq.; Grätz and Geiger), the sayings of Jesus, especially Matt. v., xv., xxiii.

[2] *Philosoph.* 9, 28: τὰ κατὰ νόμον καθαρὰ καὶ μὴ καθαρά. Jost, 1857, p. 199. The land of the Gentiles unclean, the two Joses, Herzfeld, III. p. 248.

world. The Sadducees said jestingly: The Pharisees will undertake the purification of the ball of the sun.[1]

With these burdensome trivialities, the Pharisees filled their minds and their lives. The chief exercises of religion were sacrifice, vows, the three regular hours of prayers—accompanied with much ceremonial and observed if possible in the temple, but in case of necessity even in the streets, lustrations before the worship of God and even before the reading of the Law, the washing of hands before eating—on which ceremonial Hillel and Shammai laid special stress, the washing of domestic utensils of wood, metal, and glass, the refraining from using the bread, oil, and wine of the Gentiles, the voluntary fasts until the evening, particularly on Mondays and Thursdays, and the distribution of alms. Many of these observances—as the private fasts—were not contemplated by the Law, or were enjoined only to a limited extent, as in the case of the washings, which were specially obligatory on the priests; after the exile these observances were a part of the habits of good society, and to the Pharisees belongs the merit of having brought about this general harmony of theory and practice.[2]

All these heavy burdens, an infinity of legal ordinances which not only occupied and diverted from higher moral pursuits every moment of life, but also filled life with a continual fear of omission, were imposed by the Pharisees upon themselves and upon the nation.[3] On the whole, it cannot be seriously doubted that the yoke by means of which the Pharisees endeavoured to earn for themselves and the nation the honour of being the peculiarly

[1] Herzfeld, III. p. 386. Grätz, pp. 79, 455 sqq. Geiger, pp. 8 sqq. The saying as to the washing of hands, *Sot.* 4 *b*, in Delitzsch, *Jesus und Hillel*, p. 23.

[2] Hilgenfeld has made a good collection of the different forms of abstinence of the age succeeding the exile, *Apokalyptik*, p. 253; Matt. vi. 1; Mark vii. 3—5; Luke xviii. 12. Comp. the articles, *Fasten*, *Gebet*, *Reinigungen*, in Winer and Herzog. Washing of hands, lustrations of Hillel and Shammai, Herzfeld, III. 238, 242. Refraining from what was heathen (comp. Dan. i. 5, 8) referred back to the disciples of Hillel and Shammai, *ib.* 239.

[3] Matt. xxiii. 4: *δεσμεύουσιν δὲ φορτία βαρέα και ἐπιτιθέασιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὤμους τῶν ἀνθρώπων.*

holy, priestly nation, was a very oppressive one. On the other hand, in special cases, they were ready to defend the interests of the people against the priests, as when they—especially Hillel—upheld the principle that the slaying of the Passover lamb by the people was as legal on the Sabbath as the sacrifice of the priests. In special cases they were willing to make the Law less burdensome in every-day life, as when they by means of a reservation—certainly not contemplated by Moses—abrogated the remission of debts in the year of Jubilee; when they sanctioned certain occupations on the eve of the Sabbath, and even on the Sabbath itself; when they shortened the time of the impurity of women, and permitted the utilization of the skin and bones of dead animals; when they, in opposition to the sterner Sadducees, prevented the literal execution of the law of retaliation—an eye for an eye; and when they, in judicial transactions, sanctioned the mildest interpretation of the Law.[1] But we should decide against the evidence of all the important facts concerning the Pharisees, if we ventured, with Geiger, to base upon the scattered instances given above, the conclusion that Pharisaism was a reform of the Law, an adaptation of the Law to daily life, the emancipation of the struggling and intelligent citizens from a narrow-minded hierarchy—that, indeed, Christianity and the Reformation were only revivals of Pharisaic principles. Pharisaism was neither a reformer nor an emancipator; instead of relaxing the ossified law of the letter, it made it yet more unyielding; it imposed burdens instead of removing them; it left the old hierarchy standing, and created by the side of it a new one which, as we shall presently see, only sunk the nation in subjection, contempt, and misery.[2]

Pharisaism, in fact, attained its end very imperfectly. We may admit that it did not rest until Moses was again a power in the Holy Land; it brought the great conception of a people of

[1] Comp. Jos. *Ant.* 13, 10, 6: πρὸς τὰς κολάσεις ἐπιεικῶς ἔχουσι. The principle, an eye for an eye, Grätz, p. 459. The reservation as to debts, Jost, pp. 265 sqq.

[2] Geiger, *Sadd. und Pharis.* pp. 25 sqq.

God, and the great ideals of righteousness and holiness once more to life; it aroused the nation to a zealous endeavour after a strict observance of the Law, which might sometimes put even the teachers themselves to shame.[1] The successful proselytizing zeal of the Jews was especially concentrated in Pharisaism.[2] The mass of the people, however, and the particularly enthusiastic female part of the population, the more easily accustomed themselves to admire and worship the Pharisees as saints, with the view of thus cheaply participating in their merits.[3] Yet the Pharisees did not escape criticism. They were, in general, severe towards themselves, and distinguished among themselves different grades of purity and holiness; there was nothing effeminate about them, says the historian, and their opponents, the Sadducees, testified that they mortified themselves in this world, looking for a recompence in another.[4] There were grey and reverend masters, and ardent youths—such as Saul—who consumed themselves in meditation on the Law, in zeal for God, in wrestling for righteousness, but who also longed to attain, by means of such communion with God, divine revelations.[5] But the party itself distinguished—as did king Jannæus, in his warning to Alexandra—between genuine and "painted" Pharisees, "the curse of the Pharisees;" and of seven classes, only the sixth had the credit of observing the Law out of fear of God, but the seventh out of love of God. The Pharisaical women were also reckoned among the curses of the country.[6] That observance of the Law which forgot moral

[1] Comp. Matt. xxiii. 4, 15.

[2] Comp. Matt. xxiii. 15; *Ant.* 20, 2, 4.

[3] *ὑπῆκτο ἡ γυναικωνῖτις, Ant.* 17, 2, 4. *δήμοις πιθανότατοι, ib.* 18, 1, 3. *Ib.* 13, 10, 6: *τὸ πλῆθος σύμμαχον.* Comp. the sayings of Jesus, Matt. vi. 1 sqq., xxiii. 5 sqq.

[4] *Ant.* 18, 1, 3: *τὴν δίαιταν ἐξευτελίζουσιν, οὐδὲν εἰς τὸ μαλακώτερον ἐνδιδόντες.* Conspicuous for *δίαιτα βίου καὶ λόγοι, ib.* Grades, in Jost, 1857, p. 204. Testimony of opponents, in Herzfeld, p. 385; Grätz, p. 76.

[5] Comp. Jos. *B. J.* 3, 8, 3; Acts xxiii. 9; and the history of Paul. Hausrath (*Paulus*, 1866, p. 8) exaggerates when he makes visions a characteristic of the Pharisees; Josephus has nowhere asserted this, and has ascribed the Charisma partly to the old prophets (*Ant.* 10, 11, 7), partly to the Essenes, and partly to the people in general (*ib.* 15, 10, 5).

[6] Grätz, p. 76. Jannæus, in Jost, 1857, p. 241. The women, in Herzfeld, p. 385.

principles and occupied itself only with external works, was first a mere trafficker with God, keeping a debit and credit account of sin and good works, and then naturally fell into the hyprocisy of which John and Jesus sternly complained, and to the exaggeration of which party interests and individual egotism and vanity, as well as the admiration and self-denying devotedness of the people, combined to contribute. Hence the ostentation of those who "turned away the eyes" and "closed the eyes" (in the presence of women), of those who "bent the back," of the sour countenance on fast-days, of the mincing step and pious shudder; hence the courting of public applause by "good works upon the shoulder," by almsgiving at the corners of the streets and in the synagogues, by long prayers and scourgings; hence also the greedy longing for honour and power, for the widows' money, for banquetings abroad and at home. Hence, above all, the intolerable self-conceit which paraded itself among the people, challenging them to point out a lingering defect; and which, in remarkable inversion of the teacher-sentiment, cursed with a double curse the people, the despised "people of the land," as "an abomination," "vermin," and "unclean beasts," because of their ignorance and impiety.[1] The more powerful Pharisaism became in the popular consciousness, the more effectually did it assist in bringing about the downfall of the nation: a builder of the kingdom of God, not unworthy in intention but weak in capacity, it led the national mind in paths in which there was no promise of renovation; it nurtured a merely apparent life of self-deception and arrogance; and at last suddenly renounced its task by renouncing the people, without having gathered to itself any satisfactory seed-corn for the future. For even the great thoughts from which it had sprung became eventually mere names, titles, husks, rind, which needed to be filled with substance.

[1] Grätz, l. c. Jost, p. 205. Herzfeld, pp. 381, 385. Also the Gospels, especially Matt. xxiii.; Luke xviii. 11; John vii. 49: ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος, &c. Comp. *Am haarez*. Hillel, *Pirke Ab.* I. 13: Qui serviliter (IV. 5: qui commodi causa) operam dat legi, transit. Arrogance: Tell me what is yet incumbent upon me; wherein have I failed? Herzfeld, p. 385. Comp. Matt. xix. 16 sqq.

In conclusion, it is very important that we examine more closely the views of the Pharisees with reference to the future of the kingdom of God. It is admitted that, upon this point, the strongest collision between the idea and the reality, the most daring infusion of force into the existing material, then took place: how far was the movement due to the Pharisees? We have already seen that the Scribes, with all their profound research into the most mysterious questions, were nevertheless no mere theorists: patriotism was their starting-point, the restoration of the theocracy their end, an end to which they were directed not merely by the love of their country, but also by the Law itself. The rule of God alone—the device of Judas the Galilean—was also substantially the motto of every Pharisee. This was the characteristic idea according to which they acted; by this idea they estimated the situation of the times, and this made them the dreaded and consistent critics of every administration.[1] The act of Judas the Galilean was only a vigorous practical criticism of the Roman rule, while the more prudent majority of the party remained content with verbal criticism, sometimes reserving to themselves the decision as to the fitting time for open warfare, and sometimes more religiously leaving to God the office of bringing help: thus Hillel, in particular, was more averse to insurrection than Shammai, the opponent of the Gentiles and of Rome, the teacher who forbad the relief of the sorrowful and the sick on the Sabbath and sanctioned battle with the enemy on that day, the teacher of that Zadok who was associated with Judas of Galilee.[2] Moreover, the Galilean's revolt was far from being an assertion that the divinely-appointed Messianic age was come; it was only resist-

[1] Comp. *Ant.* 17, 2, 4: *βασιλεῦσι δυνάμενοι μάλιστα ἀντιπράσσειν, προμηθεῖς κἀκ τοῦ προὔπτου εἰς τὸ πολεμεῖν τε καὶ βλάπτειν ἐπῳρμένοι.*

[2] Shammai, Grätz, pp. 207 sq.; Jost, p. 267. Jost also believes that the Zealots sprang from the Shammaites, p. 269; as well as that the traditional disciple Zadok is the Zadok of Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 1, 1, which is, however, a mistake.—Resignation even in the Rabbi Akiba, the spiritual leader of the Bar-Kochba insurrection: "What comes from heaven happens for the best," Jost, III. p. 207.

ance to a state of things which had become intolerable, a purification of the people of God from excessive defilement; at most the attempt at deliverance may have intensified the last and highest hopes of many, may have suggested to many enthusiasts the fair dream of the immediate approach of the kingdom. The main question therefore still remains: Did the Pharisees, the representatives of the idea of the kingdom, expect a perfect Messianic kingdom, and did they believe it to be at hand? The Gospels, as well as Josephus—who says that at the time of the fall of Jerusalem many wise men shared in the Daniel delusion—and the Rabbinical traditions, leave no serious doubt as to the existence of the expectation of such a kingdom and of a future world (haolam haba), although the opinions as to the nature of that kingdom may have been widely divergent. The ancient teachers, Judas ben Tabbai and Simon ben Shetah, already waited for the "consolation" of Israel, a perspective which meets us also on the threshold of the Gospels. More exactly, this is the Son of David, and his forerunner Elijah, whom the Pharisaic teaching spoke of in the time of Jesus, and transferred to the national consciousness. The assertion that Hillel expressed himself sceptically concerning the Messiah, or even refused to believe in a Messiah at all, has found, on closer research, an explanation in the fact that Hillel II., in the fourth century after Christ—at a time therefore when hope had long ebbed again—referred back the Messiah to the old bygone days of the pious king Hezekiah.[1] The expectation of the immediate approach of the kingdom was due at once to the earnestness of the preparation, to the increasing wretchedness of the Gentile times, and to the book of Daniel, which was so highly prized by the party; and it would be difficult to deny that, together with the somewhat later facts of the Jewish war and its protracted

[1] Judas ben Tabbai, &c., in Herzfeld, III. p. 332. Comp. Luke ii. 25, 38. Pharisaic expectation in New Testament, comp. Matt. xxii. 42, xvii. 10. Hillel, comp. Jost (ält. Schrift), III. p. 117. But also Grätz, IV. p. 386. Oehler, article *Messias*, p. 432.

Pharisaic-Zealotic precursors, the history of Jesus favours this opinion, for it is full of utterances concerning the expectation of the Pharisees, which goes hand in hand with his own; but it is full also of the threat that the Pharisees, in their self-righteousness, shall fail to obtain admittance into the kingdom.[1] It is at the same time easy to understand how, in the absence of any new profound religious principle, in the scantiness of a pure inspiration, and with their slavish submission to the inscrutable divine arrangement of events, the Pharisees failed to reach the bold and direct conclusion of the Baptist and Jesus, until, after long calculation, they arrived at it a generation later, under Roman oppression, under Florus instead of under Pilate; and that they first gave expression to their hope in the question that was full of doubt, When cometh the kingdom of God?[2] But however little certainty they produced in the public mind with reference to this question, it was here that their great work of preparation lay: they did not allow the most ideal conception of Israel to rest with the dead; they projected it perpetually beyond the unsatisfactory present reality; they made it a household word among the people, and saturated the whole spiritual atmosphere of Israel with it; and thus they laid throughout the land the trains by which the conflagration of those who were greater than themselves might be kindled.

We must speak not only of the party, but also of an individual. Justice demands—and indeed in more than one sense—that we should especially point out a man who was one of the worthiest contemporaries, or at any rate immediate predecessors, of Jesus; who embodied in himself all the nobility and gentleness of Pharisaism; who—as only one other did—covered all the defects of the party with his ideal and idealized personality; but who, as we must add, also betrayed the defects of the party in the invincible infirmities of his own noble nature. It is evident, without further preface, that we speak of *Hillel*, whom Renan has lately called the true teacher of Jesus,

[1] Comp. Matt. v. 20, xii. 25—28, xxi. 31 sqq., xxiii. 13. [2] Luke xvii. 20.

and Geiger the true reformer of his nation. At any rate, it is a fact that Judaism early made use of him as a shield against Christianity, as heathenism made use of Apollonius of Tyana.[1]

Hillel was a Babylonian Jew of the tribe of Benjamin, and although, according to the genealogy discovered in Jerusalem, a descendant of David, he came a poor man to Jerusalem in the reign of Hyrcanus II., to study the Law under Shemaiah and Abtalion. While his brother Shebna earned money as a merchant, Hillel spent the half denarius or franc which he received as day-labourer, partly in paying the school-fees of the renowned teachers, and partly in maintaining his family. He could not always get work; and once, in winter, when turned away from the school by the servant, he climbed to the window of the house in the darkness of the evening before the Sabbath, in order to see and hear; and in the morning, stiffened with cold and snow, was found and rescued by Shemaiah and Abtalion. "He is, in truth, worth breaking the Sabbath for." Under king Herod, a hundred years before the destruction of Jerusalem, about B.C. 30, he became the head (Nassi) of the school, and even of the Sanhedrim; and this because he was the only person who, after Pharisaism had been crushed by Herod, could give information as to the teaching of Shemaiah and Abtalion in the fierce controversy about the slaying of the Paschal lamb on the Sabbath.[2] He is said to have retained this position for forty

[1] Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, 1863, p. 35: Hillel fut le vrai maître de Jésus. Geiger, *Das Judenthum und seine Geschichte*, 1st part, 2nd ed. 1865, pp. 104 sqq. Concerning Hillel, comp. Leusden, *Pirke Abot*, p. 11. Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* p. 256. Jost, *Gesch. der Israel*, III. 111 sqq. Jost, 1857, pp. 254 sqq. Grätz, III. pp. 172 sqq. Herzfeld, III. pp. 258 sqq. Geiger, *Phar. und Sadd.* pp. 36 sqq.; ib. *Das Judenthum*, l. c. Delitzsch, *Jesus und Hillel, eine geschichtl. Vergleichung* (against Renan, Geiger), 1866. Hoffmann, article *Hillel* in Ersch and Gruber.—The parallel Apollonius of Tyana (Cappadocia), born under Augustus, flourishing after beginning of Nero's reign (A.D. 54), died under Nerva (comp. Philostratus, *V. Apoll.* 8, 27, 29; 4, 24, 40; 8, 6, 11). His glorification by Philostratus at the beginning of the third century, when all the world was going over to Christianity. Comp. Baur, *Ap. von Tyana und Christus, Tüb. Zeitschrift*, 1832, &c.

[2] A hundred years before the destruction, *Shabb.* 15 *a*, in Jost, p. 260. Delitzsch, p. 8.

years (until A.D. 10), and to have died at the age of a hundred and twenty.[1] In troublous times, he remained firm in his belief in the vocation of Israel: Am I (Israel) here, then all is here; if I fail, who remains?[2] By his side, as second head of the Palestinian school, stood Shammai, whose more rigid observance of the Law gave rise to the long-continued conflicts between the "house of Hillel" and the "house of Shammai," conflicts the reconciliation of which with school discipline taxed the acuteness of the Rabbis.[3] These very disputes, however, increased the fame of Hillel's mildness and forbearance. He was celebrated as the successor of Ezra, who brought the Law anew out of Babylon, and as the Nassi of Israel; he was not celebrated, it is true, for a fine figure, but for his thoroughly Solomonic manifold wisdom, and the divine spirit which ever animated him. Lamentations were sung over him at his death: Alas, the gentle one! alas, the pious one, the disciple of Ezra! His disciples—eighty in number—and especially Jochanan ben Zacchai and Jonathan ben Uziel, handed down his fame (thirty were worthy of the divine presence, thirty that the sun should stand still for them). The presidency of the school, and to a certain extent the high-priesthood, remained for ten generations with his posterity, among whom Gamaliel, his grandson, the son of Simeon, was also regarded, at the time of the Apostles, in the reigns of Tiberius, Caligula, and Claudius, as the ornament of the Law, but also as the end of the Law, since all reverence for its teaching, for purity and self-denial, was buried with him.[4]

[1] Forty years, Grätz, p. 205. A hundred and twenty years, Jost, p. 258. Delitzsch, p. 33.

[2] Grätz, p. 174.

[3] *Pirke Abot*, 5, 17: Omnis contentio, quæ est propter Deum, in finem usque durabit.—Quænam est contentio, quæ fit propter Deum? Illa est contentio Hillelis et Shammai (opp. Korah).

[4] Hillel's wisdom, Jost, p. 258. Delitzsch, p. 8. Figure: comp. the first scoffing words of the scoffers, Why have the Babylonians such unsightly round heads? Delitzsch, p. 31. The song of lamentation, Jost, p. 263. Delitzsch, p. 39. The number of disciples, *ib.* p. 8. Grätz, p. 206. The presidency in Hillel's family, comp. Lightfoot, p. 256. Gamaliel, *Sotah*, 49, in Jost, p. 283.

Hillel's great contribution to the development of doctrine consisted partly in his formal rules for the interpretation of the Law: for the gross and slavish adherence to the letter characteristic of the Sadducees, and also to some extent of the Shammaites, he substituted a general view of the Law as a whole, and the rational exercise of the judgment with reference to details. But he contributed still more to that development by restoring the religious-ethical and humane spirit of the Law.[1] His weightiest sayings of this character have already been quoted. It is of importance to know that the saying concerning duty to one's neighbour was impressed, as the kernel of the Law, upon one who wished to become a proselyte, and whom, as well as two others, Shammai had harshly repulsed; while the happy simplicity and enlightening truth that fell from the friendly lips of Hillel irresistibly attracted the Gentile. Yet it must not be overlooked that Hillel himself, as a Pharisee, always gave greater prominence to morality than to religion. His very moral precepts, in spite of all his warnings against a false security, and in spite of all his exhortations to energetic internal efforts, are commendations of the details of outward service as leading to life, from almsgiving to bathing and the washing of hands.[2] His relaxations of the Law are not unobjectionable: the reservation of the right to claim the payment of debts in spite of the year of Jubilee, is a crafty compromise; his concessions in the matter of divorce, and in the recognition of marriages brought about by violence, are laxities.[3] In other cases, again, Hillel indulges in trivialities: though in several particulars he successfully opposed the Sabbath strictness of the Shammaites, who forbade even the visiting of the sick on that day; yet, on the other hand, he

[1] Hillel's seven rules, Grätz, p. 175. Jost, 1857, pp. 255 sqq.

[2] *Ib.* pp. 258 sqq.

[3] The precept, It is lawful to put away a wife, even if she has merely burnt the food (Hillel), *Gittin*, 9, 10, is generally understood by modern Jews to be figurative, and to refer to cases in which the wife has sacrificed her good reputation. Jost, p. 264. But would it then read, *even if she has merely*, &c.? See Delitzsch, pp. 25 sq. Violent seduction, Jost, p. 264.

engaged in the controversy concerning the egg laid on the Sabbath—a controversy contemptibly trivial, although rewarded by a voice from heaven—and surpassed Shammai himself in punctiliousness; while his grandson Gamaliel limited travelling on the Sabbath, even to give aid to those who were in most urgent want, to a distance of 2000 paces.[1] Moreover, his concessions to Shammai have involved him in evident self-contradiction: thus the disciples of Hillel, as well as those of Shammai, forbade the use of the bread and oil of the Gentiles.[2] Finally, his fundamental religious conviction is simply a belief in retribution, and a passive resignation to the omnipotence of God, modified only by an unshakable faith in the calling of Israel and in the grace of God, who will one day make the balance incline in favour of even those who are only half good.[3] What is most estimable is his personal character: we find in him a devotedness to God which is confident that no cry of despair can proceed from his house; inexhaustible patience and forbearance, whether with the Shammaites or with the scoffers that wagered they would provoke him to anger; and, finally, an unbounded beneficence, instances of which are seen in his hiring a horse and attendants for an impoverished rich man, and in his even going himself before the same man for a distance of nearly fifteen miles.[4] Among his genuinely human and amiable traits is his defence of the song to the bride, "Ah, the lovely and charming bride!" against Shammai, who harshly insisted upon the literal truth, while Hillel found every bride worthy of praise from the standpoint of the bridegroom.[5] One weakness, however, has not been concealed by tradition. Once when he caused a sacrifice to be slain in the outer court of the temple, he declared, in order to avoid a dispute with the Shammaites, that the ox was a cow, and craftily covered the animal with the skirts of his dress. In

[1] Sabbath, comp. Jost, p. 267. Gamaliel, *ib.* p. 282. The egg controversy (Beza), Delitzsch, pp. 21 sq.

[2] Herzfeld, III. 239. Also the land of the Gentiles, *ib.* 249.

[3] Geiger, p. 103.

[4] Grätz, p. 174. Delitzsch, pp. 31 sq.

[5] *Ib.* p. 32.

this case Hillel exhibits not only a want of veracity, but also—as in several of his expositions—cunning; and in his love of peace and in his passive piety he becomes cowardly.[1] But looking at the whole character of the man, who can avoid loving and honouring him? He was, however, as little the teacher of Jesus—who promptly rejected the Hillelic hand-washing and trifling with marriage—as he was the true reformer of Judaism, one who, as we have been told, was differently historically attested than was Jesus, and possessed thoughts of his own, understood the age, was a man of every-day life and not of the cell, the author of a peaceful development, a man of temperate ideas concerning the future of Judaism, one whose work was only marred by the enthusiastic national religion of Christianity. Such child's tales given to the world by Geiger, in his blind envy of one who was greater than Hillel, are self-condemned before the tribunal of an unprejudiced judgment. For, quite apart from the invincible contradiction between the subjective tendency of Hillel and the objective standpoint—the belief of Shammai in the letter, and the belief in tradition of the whole school—it must first be shown that the so-called reformer of Judaism originated one great thought, and the great unsightly defects, which adhere to him so visibly to the present day, must be removed.[2]

2.—The Sadducees.

The *Sadducees*, the antipodes of the Pharisees, were far from possessing the same importance. They formed the "second" party, and owed their greatness to their opposition to the "first." They were few in number, without influence among the people, and their piety was characterized by neither warmth nor novelty.[3]

[1] Jost, p. 267. Yet more plainly, Delitzsch, p. 33.

[2] Comp. the violent utterances of Geiger, *Das Judenthum und s. Gesch.* pp. 99—112.

[3] *Ant.* 18, 1, 4: ὀλίγοι ἄνδρες. The principal passages concerning them in Josephus, *B. J.* 2, 8, 14; *Ant.* 13, 5, 9; 13, 10, 6; 18, 1, 4. *Philosoph.* 9, 29. Grossmann, in his *Programmen über die philosophia Sadducæorum*, 1836, has arbitrarily applied to them all sorts of anonymous passages in Philo.

Their chief value, in the history of the religious movements of the period, is derived from their making apparent the barriers against which Pharisaism—the religious movement that possessed the greater vitality—chafed; and from their making it possible, by means of the law of contrast, to draw more definitely and in sharper outline the physiognomy of Pharisaism.

It is, however, not quite easy to describe them. The New Testament gives prominence to such of their characteristics as are not fundamental. The Fathers of the Church have falsely, and the later rabbis one-sidedly, represented them as Epicureans; and recently, Langen, improving upon this verdict, has spoken of them as Epicureans and materialists. Down to the most recent date, opinions have widely differed. Their original religious attitude has on the whole been ascertained; but critics have placed in the foreground, sometimes their clinging to antiquity, sometimes their sympathy with the Greeks, sometimes their political, and sometimes their religious moderation; and nothing but confusion results from the attempt to reconcile their abundant individual traits. The reader is referred to Grätz and Herzfeld, but also to Ewald. Fresh and noteworthy conclusions have been arrived at by Hitzig and Geiger.[1]

A view of the social position of the Sadducees, though apparently a most superficial consideration, gives at once a deep insight into the character of this faction. The Pharisees were the favourites of the masses; while the Sadducees, hated by the people, were the first in office and in dignity, and reckoned their

[1] Comp. Ewald, IV. pp. 358 sqq., 492 sqq. Grätz, p. 76. Jost, *Gesch. der Isr. seit der Zeit der Makk.* III. p. 67; ib. *Judenth.* p. 214. Herzfeld, III. pp. 356. Langen, pp. 237 sqq. Also Winer; Reuss, *Hist. de la théol. chrét.* 3rd ed. I. pp. 60 sqq., 70 sqq. Observe that Grätz does not proceed from the politicians to the religious; nor Herzfeld from the religious, the truly righteous, to the aristocrats, the rich, and the sympathizers with the Greeks. Hitzig, *Psalmen*, 1865, II. p. 414. Geiger, *Sadd. und Pharis.* 1863. The New Testament, see below, p. 360. The Church Fathers supposed that the Sadducees accepted only the Law, and rejected the Prophets; see *Philosoph.* 9, 29. Origen, *Con. Cels.* 1, 49, who classes them with the Samaritans: οἱ μόνου Μωυσέως παραδεχόμενοι τὰς βίβλους σαμαρεῖς ἢ σαδδουκαῖοι. In like manner, Tert. *Præscr.* 45, where they take their rise from the Samaritan Dositheus. Jerome on Matt. xxii. Comp. below, p. 357, note.

adherents among the rich.[1] From the time of John Hyrcanus, they are often found holding the office of high-priest; and it may be assumed that the family of Boethus—which from the time of the marriage of Herod the Great with the second Mariamne, the daughter of Simon ben Boethus (B.C. 24), so often held the high-priesthood—was connected with the Sadducees, among whom they are ranked in the somewhat mythical writings of the rabbis (Zadok and Baitos are said to have been scholars of Antigonus of Socho, cir. B.C. 200); and since it may also be assumed that the high-priests Annas and Caiaphas, the contemporaries of Jesus, were Sadducees, it follows that the latter contributed by far the greater number of names to the high-priest's chair, down to the destruction of Jerusalem. This sheds a fresh light on the characteristic of the Pharisees—"opposition to the kings and the high-priests."[2] After all, the Sadducees were nothing more than the Jewish, and, more exactly, the sacerdotal aristocracy; and this is precisely what their name implies. By the Church Father, Epiphanius, the name is, indeed, translated "the Righteous" (Zaddikim); and among modern writers, Herzfeld has retained this interpretation; and in fact the Sadducees were the righteous, that is, those who strictly observed the letter of the Law.[3] But the modification of the

[1] *πρῶτοι τοῖς ἀξιώμασι*, *Ant.* 18, 1, 4. *τοὺς εὐπόρους μόνον πείθοντες*, *ib.* 13, 10, 6. — *μὴ ἄλλως ἀνεκτοὶ τοῖς πλήθεσι*, *ib.* 18, 1, 4. *τὸ δημοτικὸν οὐχ ἑπόμενον αὐτοῖς, τῶν φαρισαίων τὸ πλῆθος σύμμαχον ἐχόντων*, *ib.* 13, 10, 6.

[2] *Ant.* 13, 10, 5; 17, 2, 4. Boethus (Talm. gives the pl.), *ib.* 15, 9, 3, and often when the descendants are mentioned. The year of Herod's connection with this family can be exactly calculated from Josephus: it was immediately after the famine (which was in A.U.C. 729, 730 = B.C. 25, 24, when Petronius was prefect of Egypt; comp. Mommsen, *Res gest. div. Aug.* 74 sq., who incorrectly defers the prefecture until 731, 732), and before Herod's great building operations, *i.e.* about B.C. 24, 23. Comp. above, p. 246. The later high-priests, see Schrader. Annas and Caiaphas, comp. *Gesch. Christus*, p. 239.

[3] Epiph. *Haer.* 1, 14: *ἐπονομάζουσιν ἑαυτοὺς σαδδουκαίους δῆθεν ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ὁρμωμένης. σεδὲκ γὰρ ἑρμηνεύεται δικαιοσύνη.* Herzfeld, III. p. 358, gives a quite untenable explanation of the change of "i" into "u" as an attempt to assimilate the pronunciation of the word to *Perushim*. Instead of Zadok and Sadok, stand Saduk and Sadduk, *e. g.* Neh. x. 21, iii. 29, xi. 11 (LXX.). Jos. *Ant.* 18, 1, 1, &c.

vowel cannot be in any way explained; and the rabbis, as we have seen, have preferred to derive the word—with the help of the fabulous—from the personal name Zadok. This derivation from Zadok is accepted, though in very different ways, by Ewald, Hitzig, and Geiger,—Ewald referring to the mythical name of the rabbis, while Hitzig and Geiger have a principle in view.[1] The high-priestly house of Zadok (whence Zadduk, at least in Greek) stretched backwards to the glorious times of David, indeed to Phinehas the Zealous, the son of Eleazar, and grandson of Aaron.[2] Zadok was the faithful priest who wished to accompany David, with the ark of the covenant and with the Levites, when the king was fleeing before Absalom. Solomon appointed Zadok high-priest instead of Abiathar, and Zadok's sons succeeded him in office until the days of the exile. After the exile, the Zadokites, who were highly praised by Ezekiel, the prophet of the exile, for their steadfast faithfulness, were among the first to return to the holy soil, and their priests and scribes were fellow-workers with Nehemiah.[3] They retained the high-priesthood until the Syro-Asmonæan period, when they were supplanted by Alcimus, a collateral descendant of Aaron (B.C. 162); and afterwards for a long time by Jonathan and the Asmonæans, who were ordinary priests of the house of Jojarib (from B.C. 152).[4] The Zadokites, the genuine representatives of the high-priesthood, of its privileges and traditions, resisted the two-fold attack

[1] Hitzig, *Psalm.* II. p. 414 : צָרוֹק, *σάδωκος*, was later pronounced צָדוֹק (comp. יָבֹק from יָבֹק), and thence צָדִקִי. Comp. previous note.—Ewald, IV. pp. 358 sqq., 493 sqq. Nor can I subscribe to the characteristic here given. "It is the school of freedom of life, thought, and endeavour," in the Greek age which, as to morality, had sunk so low. Where remains here their conservatism? Certainly Ewald makes a remarkable distinction between two stages, the second introduced by the appearance of the Pharisees and by a Boethus; but this again is historically untenable.

[2] *Ant.* 7, 5, 4.

[3] 2 Sam. viii. 17, xv. 24. Jos. *Ant.* 7, 2, 2; 7, 5, 4; 7, 9, 2; 7, 9, 7; 7, 11, 1, and 4; 8, 1, 4. Neh. iii. 29, xi. 11, xiii. 13; Ezekiel xlviii. 11. Jos. *Ant.* 10, 8, 6.

[4] Comp. Jos. 12, 9, 7; 20, 10, 3. 1 Macc. vii. 14; 2 Macc. xiv. 7.

of the new spirit of the times, of the Pharisees and the Asmonæans: hence arose the party of the Sadducees, who singularly enough, as Hitzig remarks, are first mentioned in history under that Asmonæan who deprived them of the high-priesthood, and who consistently took his stand, with his immediate successors, on the side of their opponents. The antagonism afterwards became less bitter, and after the time of John Hyrcanus the interests of the Asmonæans and the Zadokites become identical: the defence of the ancient hierarchical system and the struggle for power continued to be the task of Sadduceism, and in the execution of this task it survived the Asmonæans. The house of Boethus could never be altogether merged in the Sadducean party, because, although an illustrious Alexandrian priestly house, it had no legitimate claim to the high-priesthood; but political considerations—hierarchical ambition and the antagonism of the Pharisees—bridged over the chasm.

Sacerdotal aristocracy, nobility, riches, imply conservatism. In reality, the first principle of the party was, Maintenance of the Mosaic ordinances—nothing but the Law! "The Pharisees have taught the people, as law, much out of the tradition of the Fathers, which is not written in the Laws of Moses; and therefore the party of the Sadducees reject these things, saying that men must regard as legal everything that stands written, but that men are not compelled to observe the precepts derived from the tradition of the Fathers." The meaning of these sentences is as clear as possible; and it betrays great power of misconception in Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, and Jerome, when they convert the Sadducees into rejecters of the prophets, to whom it can be proved that they appealed, though, like their opponents, they undervalued them.[1] The Sadducees adhered to the Law, but they rejected the Pharisaic *additions* as *innovations:* they are hence in the Mischna sometimes described as Karaites. They

[1] *Ant.* 18, 1, 4; 13, 10, 6. Appeals are made by the Sadducees, *e.g.*, to Am. iv. 13 (Win.). Tert. *Præscr.* 45. Hipp. *Phil.* 9, 29. Origen, *Con. Cels.* 1, 49. Jerome on Matt. xxii. Comp. above, p. 354, note.

hated—as we can easily understand—the new authority of the scribes, which so seriously diminished that of the priesthood; but the new doctrine they rejected on its own account, because it sometimes contradicted Moses, and sometimes ascribed to him what he had not said. It was a protest against the flood of tradition, a protest which was not without justification, and which would have resembled the attack of Jesus on the sayings of men, and the Reformation, if only—to say nothing of its want of consistency—it had been prompted less by unworthy motives, and more by a new and profound interest in the word of God. History, or at least tradition, has fastened on the Sadducees the sarcasm that they were unable to defend their position by the Scriptures themselves; and hence, through Simon ben Shetah, lost their place in the Sanhedrim.

The first principle of the Sadducees was that the letter of the Law must be strictly observed.[1] In their many controversies with their opponents, we see them clinging to the written word. The strongest evidence of this position is seen in the fact that they insisted upon the literal observance of the judicial maxim, An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. The same principle also underlay their theory of the uncleanness of a woman after childbirth, of the uncleanness of a dead body, of the burning of the incense (Lev. xvi. 2, &c.), of the day of the feast of weeks. Their vindication of the sacerdotal dignity and privileges was based on the letter of the Law and on the interests of the class. The priests alone, and not the people, had a right to break the Sabbath by offering sacrifice; the priests alone were free to go beyond the prescribed distance on the Sabbath to their festival meals. The bloody sacrifice which accompanied the meat-offering belonged to the priests, and not to the altar. From the priests, on the other hand, they required (the reader is referred to the case of the high-priest Matthias under Herod) for certain functions the highest Levitical purity, which the "pure" Pharisees were willing to dispense with. They were inexorably severe

[1] Comp. Hipp. *Phil.* 9, 29 : *μόνῳ τῷ διὰ Μωυσέως νομῳ, μηδὲν ἑρμηνεύοντες.*

in the punishment of offences against the Law. It was in defence of the Law that they took action so hastily against Jesus, and yet more furiously against his brother James. Josephus says that they were harsh and cruel when passing sentence upon other Jews, and that they were fierce towards each other. Their punishments were severe, even when not prescribed by the Law. Only on one point were they milder in judgment than their adversaries: they obeyed the Law in punishing, not opinions, but acts.[1]

Relying upon the Law, they determinedly rejected the new religiousness of the Pharisees. They knew nothing of the stringent fasts and purifications, except to deride them. They hated also the aims and efforts of the people that came into competition with the religious monopoly of the priests who blamelessly performed the duties of their office. In their manner of living they were not precisely Epicureans, for they preached the necessity of living according to the Law, if one would live pleasantly and leave children behind him; yet they were "more delicate" than their opponents, and gold and silver plate was in daily use in their houses.[2] The fourth of the so-called Psalms of Solomon seems to refer to them, charging them, not only with hypocritical strictness in their observance of the Law, but with unlawful, sensual, and indeed impure habits of life.[3] The controversy of the Sadducees with the Pharisees as to the general teaching of the Old Testament was, however, extremely noteworthy, and not altogether without good result. Here they rose above the letter to the spirit, and compelled the national mind to an independent consideration of the contrasts between the old and the new

[1] Proofs from the rabbis, in Herzfeld, III. pp. 364, 385 sq., Grätz, and Geiger. Jos. *B. J.* 2, 8, 14: σαδδουκαίων δὲ προς ἀλλήλους τὸ ἦθος ἀγριώτερον, αἵ τε ἐπιμιξίαι πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀπηνεῖς, ὡς πρὸς ἀλλοτρίους. Similarly, *Ps. Sal.* 4, 2.

[2] Among the Pharisees, οὐδὲν μαλακώτερον, *Ant.* 18, 1, 3. *Philos.* 9, 29: τοῖς τοῦ νόμου ἔθεσι προσέχουσι, λέγοντες δεῖν οὕτω ζῆν, ἵνα καλῶς βιώσῃ καὶ τέκνα ἐπὶ γῆς καταλείπῃ. The latter golden rule the Pharisees certainly also had, *B. J.* 3, 8, 5. Golden plate, Grätz, III. p. 456. Herzfeld, p. 385.

[3] *Ps. Sal.* 4, 1—11.

which was being presented to the people as old. Against the doctrine—which had been introduced not without a degree of affected piety—of the sole agency of God in matters both good and evil, and of a divine, or indeed astrological fate, they justly vindicated the unfettered right of freely choosing good or evil as the fundamental idea in the covenant between the nation and God, although the Old Testament gave countenance to both views.[1] They opposed the doctrines which had sprung up since the exile, viz., the transference of the kingdom of God to the other side of the grave, the retribution in a future life, the resurrection, a heaven of angels and spirits; and they held fast the limitation of the theocracy to this earth, to their own land, the temporal reward and long life, according to the words of the older Scriptures.[2] According to Hippolytus, they asserted that man's end and aim are limited to earth, and that he finds his resurrection in his children; the highest gain, the true destiny of this existence, is to be sought in a pleasant life, in riches and honour, in the avoidance of punishment by acting justly and by exhibiting a placable disposition, in leaving a posterity, and in dying without fear or hope for soul or body. All the articles of this faith are not equally well attested. The denial of the resurrection and of the future retribution—into which Zadok and Boethos, according to the legend, distorted the words of Antigonus against serving for hire—is undoubted, and the reverse of this denial follows as a matter of course. The only early authority for the denial of angels and spirits is the Acts of the Apostles; and it is very possible that they did not question the appearance of angels in the Old Testament, as transient instances of theophany, but derided as a dream of the Pharisees the permanent, established, concrete world beyond the grave, inhabited by men and angelic spirits, the latter indeed

[1] *B. J.* 2, 8, 14. Epiph. *Haer.* 1, 16, 2, speaks of the astrology of the Pharisees.

[2] *B. J.* 2, 8, 14; *Ant.* 18, 1, 4. *Philos.* 9, 29.

with distinctive names, grades, and ranks.[1] We spoke of a certain justice in the criticism of the Sadducees; it does not follow therefore that we deny that this criticism, by contenting itself with Jewish temporal felicity, excluded that development which is indispensable to the human soul, and which the suffering people of God were compelled, by irresistible divine appointment, to secure to mankind as a permanent possession. Sadduceism, in its petrified archaism and hierarchical self-complacency, assumes a yet more dreary character when we remember that—to say nothing of a future life—it never warmly interested itself in the ideal of the present life, the ideal kingdom of God upon earth. The expression was never found in the mouth of the Sadducee. The kingdom of God was good as it then existed. There was no need of a future king, of a sanctified nation. So long as they had Moses, so long as a priesthood existed, so long as man lived uprightly and enjoyed rationally, earthly life was endurable enough, happy enough.

Sadduceism was Mosaic archaism. But this archaism had a wonderful and yet quite intelligible ally in a certain sympathy with the new culture.[2] A rigid hierarchy can to a certain extent allow itself to be washed by the waves of new ideas without danger; it gains a semblance of enlightenment, while its foundations are secured by their age and their diametrical contrast against the overflowing of the waters. A hierarchy lacks the glow of religious conviction, and is in a position to make terms with what is foreign. Sadduceism, in particular, lacked the anxious attention to purity which occasioned the gulf between Pharisaism and Rome. On the other hand, the high position of the Sadducees, their wealth and substance, naturally brought them into closer connection with the great powers of the time,

[1] Comp. Acts xxiii. 8; Matt. xxii. 23. Tert. *Præscr.* 45: Ausi etiam resurr. carnis negare. *Philos.* 9, 29, also denial of angels and spirits. Jerome on Matt. xxii.: Priores Sadd. corporis et animæ resurr. credebant confitebanturque angelos et spiritum, sequentes omnia denegabant. Of the disciples of Antigonus (see above, p. 339) it is said in Ab. R. Natan, cap. 5, that they would not have thus spoken had they believed there was another world and a living again of the dead. Herzfeld, III. p. 382.

[2] Jost also speaks of those who sympathized with the Greeks, p. 215.

including Rome, and enticed them to embellish their lives by foreign art and culture. It is therefore not surprising that the Sadducees should appear as counsellors of the princes to whom Jewish history has accorded the doubtful honour of being representatives of Philhellenism; that the family of Boethus supported the policy of Herod the Great, and is to be reckoned among the Herodians of the New Testament; that the Boethian Joazar, the high-priest, reconciled the people to the inauguration of the Roman rule by the census of Quirinius; and, finally, that the Sadducees should take no offence at the insertion of the name, not only of Moses, but also of God, in the documents beginning with the names of the Roman rulers.[1]

The Sadducees appear to have reconciled themselves more fully than the Pharisees with the Greek mode of teaching.[2] They, as well as the Pharisees, had their schools, their scribes, and their own writings; and it is possible that they were compelled by the Pharisees to carry their controversies into the ground of the latter, in the synagogues as well as in separate schools.[3] Legal questions formed also their chief theme. We have no exact information as to how far they adopted Greek culture. The later rabbis have accused them of Greek tendencies; and we know that at any rate they did not object to the reading of the Homeric poems, and that they scornfully accused the Pharisees of fearing defilement, not from contact with them, but from contact with sacred books.[4] It is in any case very probable that they inherited lax principles with reference to the questions on the border-land between Judaism and Hellenism, from their antecedents, from their descent from the Hellenized high-priesthood of the Syrian period; and we may make this

[1] Comp. the Galilean Sadducees, an exception to the rule, Herzfeld, III. pp. 386, 388.

[2] Frankel, Bretschneider, and Ewald, have somewhat exaggerated this feature; and Köster has even explained *Zedduki* = Stoics; comp. Herzfeld, p. 383.

[3] *Ant.* 18, 1, 4; Acts xxiii. 6—9: *γραμματεῖς τοῦ μέρους τῶν σαδδ., φαρισ.* Comp. Luke xi. 45. Writings of the Sadducees, Herzfeld, p. 365.

[4] Geiger, *Sadd. und Pharis.* p. 17.

assumption without bringing them into connection—as Ewald does—directly with the freedmen of the Syrian period, or—as Hitzig does—specially with Alcimus, and also without overlooking their conservative fundamental tendency, and their remote relationship with the spirit of the Asmonæan movement, in the midst of the unbridled Hellenism of those days. The extraordinary fondness for disputation which characterized the Sadducees affords the strongest argument for believing that they adopted Greek customs. Contrary to Pharisaic, and indeed to Oriental, practice, they were subject to no authority. The one contended with the other, the scholar with the teacher.[1] By virtue of this spirit of contradiction, which turned debate into a mere trial of skill, they deserved more than any other Jews the name of those Greek sophists who defended everything and disputed everything, although Josephus has given that name to the Pharisees. How far their denial of the universal determination of events by God, of the resurrection, and of the life after death, and their vindication of human freedom, were derived from the Greek schools, is uncertain; but it is not improbable that they strengthened the Old Testament basis of their faith by the aid of Greek unbelief. Hence they appear even in the Talmud as Epicureans, as Minim, as heretics; whilst recently Stäudlin has called them Stoics, and Langen again Epicureans. Though we must be very cautious in this matter, especially as Josephus has refrained from comparing them with the Greeks, yet a connection between them and the Epicureans is distinctly indicated both by their principles and the Jewish tradition, and also indeed by isolated remarks of Josephus.[2] We may wonder

[1] *Ant.* 18, 1, 4.

[2] As to the Sadducees, we have, in the first instance, proof only of their complete denial of the εἱμαρμένη, which is not to be considered as absolutely = Providence, and of an irresistible divine impulsion to evil, so that Langen (p. 239) goes too far when he makes εἱμ. = πρόνοια. Even the *Philos.* 9, 29, say that the Sadducees, in a genuinely Jewish manner, declared obedience to the Law to be necessary, ἵνα καλῶς βιώσῃ τις καὶ τέκνα ἐπὶ γῆς καταλείπῃ: therefore the gift of children is the divine reward for observance of the Law. On the other hand, it is at the same time said, *ib.*: μέλειν θεῷ μηδὲν τῶν καθ' ἕνα, therefore no special providence. This last statement would

at the hermaphroditism of these facts; yet it is by no means a more remarkable instance than that of the Roman priests. A Scævola and a Cotta were philosophic sceptics, but at the same time dignified pontiffs. Moreover, we must not altogether overlook the inevitable fact that the Sadducees, notwithstanding their perfectly tranquil bearing in the priestly office, now and then passionately asserted their independence, as did the Roman colleges, and in earlier days the sympathizers with the Greeks under Epiphanes.[1]

The Sadducees stood completely isolated. They were hated by the people on account of both their want of piety and their cruel severity. Notwithstanding their offices and dignities, they were not the leaders of Israel. When they acted upon their principles, they roused the people to rebellion. If they wished to bring anything to a successful issue, they were obliged, however much against their will, to follow the Pharisees.[2] Their own women often leaned towards the more "pious" Pharisees, and sought advice of the latter in questions of purity.[3] If the Sadducees now and then craftily succeeded in drawing the Pharisees after them, there is no doubt that they were far oftener drawn by the Pharisees. In their want of influence as well as

have earned for them the name of Epicureans. But it must be remarked that this can be simply an approximate, yet inexact, conclusion of the later author's; that the rabbis, even though they despised the Sadducees as Epicureans, nowhere charge them with the above statement; and that the above statement stands in direct contradiction to the former one. Whether, therefore, *e.g.*, Jos. *Ant.* 10, 11, 7, attacks them as Epicureans, is at least not quite certain; and the ἐφορᾶν, *B. J.* 2, 8, 14: θεὸν ἔξω τοῦ δρᾶν τι κακὸν ἢ μὴ δρᾶν (al. ἢ εφορᾶν) τίθενται, which Winer, II. p. 418, and Ewald, IV. p. 362, would retain, is, in spite of Rufinus, rendered untenable by the context.

[1] *Succa*, 4, 9 *b*. Winer, 2nd ed. II. p. 418. The priests at the time of Antiochus, 2 Macc. iv. 14.

[2] *Ant.* 18, 1, 4: πράσσεταί τε ἀπ' αὐτῶν οὐδὲν ὡς εἰπεῖν. ὁπότε γὰρ ἐπ' ἀρχὰς παρέλθοιεν, ἀκουσίως μὲν καὶ κατ' ἀνάγκας, προσχωροῦσι δ'οὖν οἷς ὁ φαρισαῖος λέγει, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἄλλως ἀνεκτοὺς γενέσθαι τοῖς πλήθεσι. This passage also has been often falsely explained. "Unwillingly" is referred to the preceding taking of office, instead of to the following yielding to the Pharisees. But if it is a fact that the Sadducees were, as a rule, in possession of the higher offices, it is clear that they did not prefer private life.

[3] *Nidda*, 33 *b*. *Tosifta* on *Nidda*, 5, in Herzfeld, III. pp. 368, 386.

in their principles, the utter feebleness of the movement betrays itself: without any impulse of higher inspiration, without love for the people, a characterless medley of hierarchical rigidity and foreign illumination, Sadduceism can be regarded as in the main only a stage, a halting-point, in the process of dissolution, not a source of fresh life; it was only a drag on the national spirit, which outstripped it, or, so far as it was restrained by Sadduceism, was corrupted by it.

Fifth Section.—The Separatists in the Holy Land.

II.—*The Essenes.*

The Judaism of the pre-Christian era reached its highest, though not irreproachable, point of development in the order of the *Essenes*. This is, at the same time, the most perplexing form of Judaism. The Essenes presented points of contact with the Pharisees, and yet again were very characteristically distinct from them; they were strict observers of the Law, and yet transgressed the Law; they were righteous in the spirit of the prophets, and yet were more painfully intent upon maintaining outward purity than the Pharisees. They were Jews, and yet separated themselves from their nation; worshippers of Jehovah, and yet prayed like the Gentiles to the sun. A Mosaic composition without inner unity, a phenomenon of religious despair, they have been the object of admiration to Jews, Gentiles, and Christians, although their admirers are to this day uncertain whether they were Jews, or a Jewish-Gentile school, or indeed, according to the opinion of Eusebius, Christians.[1]

[1] Comp. concerning the Essenes, above all, Jos. *B. J.* 2, 8, 2—13; *Ant.* 13, 5, 9; 15, 10, 4, 5; 18, 1, 2—6. Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber*, pp. 867 sqq.; *De vita contemplativa* (concerning Therapeutæ), pp. 889 sqq. Details in Philo, *Apol. p. Jud.*, and extracts from the same in Eus. *Præp. ev.* 8, 10 sq. Pliny, 5, 17. Hipp. *Philos.* 9, 18—27. Porph. *De abst.* 4, 11—14. Eusebius' misunderstanding, Eus. 2, 17.

The society of Essenes does not go back, as the elder Pliny fables (and Hippolytus has a somewhat similar idea), for thousands of years, nor even, as Philo supposes, to the time of Moses; it is, however, not so altogether modern as Zeller, in order to support his hypothesis of a connection between the Essenes and Neo-Pythagoreans, has assumed. We are saved also from Herzfeld's uncertain calculations by Josephus.[1] According to the latter, the rise of the Essenes was contemporaneous with that of the Pharisees and Sadducees, that is, in the middle of the second century before Christ. If we are justified in regarding the community as in some sort an offshoot from the party of the Pharisees, and, on the ground of the oath taken by the members, in fixing upon a time when it was possible for the individual to obtain "rule"—that is, in the Asmonæan period—we shall also be led to the years B.C. 160—130. We have more definite notices of the Essenes at a little later period; as, for example, the information given by Josephus, that the murder of Antigonus by his brother, king Aristobulus (B.C. 106), had been predicted by the old, renowned Essene, Judas. From that time we find scattered notices down to the boyhood and the reign of Herod the Great, to whom the Essene Menahem foretold his dominion and its limits (cir. B.C. 60 and 30); and on account of this prediction, the often severely persecuted community en-

Among moderns, besides Bellermann, Gfrörer, Dähne, and Credner, especially Ewald, IV. pp. 476 sqq. Zeller, *Philos. der Greichen*, III. 2, pp. 583 sqq. *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, pp. 401 sqq. Ritschl, *ib.* 1855, pp. 315 sqq.; comp. ib. *Altkathol. Kirche*, 2nd ed. p. 179. Hilgenfeld, *Jud. Apokalyptik*, 1857, pp. 245 sqq. Frankel's *Zeitschrift f. rel. Interessen des Judenthums*, III. pp. 441 sqq. (the Essenes, a sketch); Frankel's *Monatschrift*, II. pp. 30 sqq., 61 sqq. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*. III. pp. 79 sqq., 463 sqq. Herzfeld, III. pp. 368 sqq., 398 sqq. Uhlhorn, article *Essener*, Herzog, IV. pp. 174 sqq. Onias, also, the friend of God (see above, note, p. 312) is regarded by Grätz as an Essene (pp. 133, 136); but Josephus does not give him this title. Nor is the patriotic and hierarchical bearing of the man exactly Essenic.

[1] Pliny, 5, 17: Per secula seculorum. *Philos.* 9, 27: ἀρχαιοτέρα (ἡ κατὰ τούτους ἄσκησις) πάντων ἐθνῶν. Herzfeld fixes the rise of the Essenes, in one place in B.C. 220—200, and in another in B.C. 170.

joyed the toleration, protection, and honour of the king.[1] In these notices, Essenism exhibits, at any rate, peculiar characteristics: its famous teachers are in Jerusalem, which was not the case later, and they sit—as Judas, for instance—with their scholars in the courts of the temple, which they afterwards shunned. At the time of Herod, and even of Archelaus, Menahem, and then Simon, were still at the seat of government; Menahem is said to have been for a time even a member of the Sanhedrim, and many other Essenes were pleased to share in the honours of Herod's court and to take part in the government.[2] At the same time, the Essenes appear to have occupied themselves to a large extent with soothsaying and instruction in the art of soothsaying (Judas, Menahem), as well as with the interpretation of dreams (Simon). We see from this that Essenism passed through certain stages of development, that in particular it gradually withdrew itself from the national life. It is less correct to say with Hilgenfeld that Essenism was in its origin a new prophetic, apocalyptic school: the teachers of the Essenes, as well as the latter themselves, were renowned for their exemplary lives and steadfast refusal to take an oath; the greater number of them did not make a profession of prophecy, and the general character of their association, based essentially upon the practice of virtue, is simply inexplicable from the standpoint of the schools of prophecy.[3] It is difficult to obtain any explanation of the original character of the Essenes from their name. This name has called forth numberless interpretations: the Essenes were the healers, the holy, the pious, those

[1] Ἐσσαῖοι, in Philo; ἐσσαῖοι, and more frequently ἐσσηνοί, in Josephus; Esseni, in Pliny. τάγμα, Josephus; ὅμιλος, Philo; Pliny, *Hist. nat.* V. 17. Their rise, Jos. *Ant.* 13, 5, 9. Judas the Essene, *B. J.* 1, 3, 5; *Ant.* 13, 11, 2. Menahem, *ib.* 15, 10, 5. Persecutions (Jannæus?), Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* p. 879.

[2] Judas, *B. J.* 1, 3, 5; *Ant.* 13, 11, 2. Menahem, *ib.* 15, 10, 4, 5. Simon, *B. J.* 2, 7, 3; *Ant.* 17, 13, 3. Essenes at the time of Herod, *Ant.* 15, 10, 5.

[3] Comp. Josephus on Menahem, *Ant.* 15, 10, 5. Also with reference to the Essenes in general, he gives the καλοκαγαθία precedence over the ἐμπειρία τῶν θείων, *ib.* In *B. J.* 2, 8, 12, we find: εἰσὶ δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς, οἳ καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα προγιγνώσκειν ὑπισχνοῦνται.

who trusted in God, the mysteriously silent, the watchers, the seers, the doers, the baptists. Of these meanings, the best would be the "pious" of Ewald, the "silent" of Jost, and the "baptists" of Grätz, if such titles were not too general, and if they retained a more decided historical trace of their original appropriateness; for the connection of the later Jewish "morning baptists" with the Essenes is doubtful. On the other hand, the meaning, "healers," "physicians," is open to no such objection; it was a name that readily suggested itself to the people, and was especially appropriate to many members of the order; it can also be proved that the Essenes themselves used it, aptly spiritualizing it by calling themselves the physicians of both body and soul. But neither does this title lead us to the very heart of the matter in question.[1] In order to penetrate to some extent into the secret, we will examine the phenomenon of Essenism at its most flourishing period, in the time of Jesus and immediately afterwards, as we find it described by Philo and Josephus.

The Essenes, estimated by Philo at above 4000, by the later Josephus at 4000, were essentially Jews, living exclusively in the Holy Land and in the neighbouring parts of Syria, where there was a strong infusion of Jewish elements; as a rule, they lived in large communities, partly in "towns of the order,"

[1] See the explanations of the name in Ewald, IV. p. 484. Grätz, p. 469. Jost, 1857, p. 207. Herzfeld, pp. 393 sqq. חֹזֵה (seers, *μάντεις*, *θεωρητικοὶ*, Heysch., Suid., Hilgenf.). The same word = חָסִיד = pious, Ewald; חָנָן = guardian, Ewald formerly. Others from עשׂה = worker of miracles; סחא (bathers, *ἡμεροβαπτιστοὶ*, Banain), Grätz; חשׁא or חשׁה = the silent, Jost. The signification *ὅσιοι* (the holy) is in Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* p. 876. Eus. *Præp. ev.* 8, 11. Salmasius thought of the Syrian town Essa, *Ant.* 13, 15, 3. The derivation from אסא = to heal, and אסוא (healer), אָסָיָא (the healing one), also in Baur, Uhlhorn, Renan, Herzfeld, pp. 371 sqq., 393 sq. It is supported as well by the language as by the Greek name *θεραπευταὶ*, used by Philo himself for the Essenes (*Q. o. p. l.* p. 876), and, finally, by the earliest express information. Philo, *De vita cont.* p. 889 (of the Therapeutæ), *ἰατρικὴ κρείττων τῆς κατὰ πόλεις*. Josephus, *B. J.* 2, 8, 6: *τὰ πρὸς ὠφέλειαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἐκλέγοντες—πρὸς θεραπείαν παθῶν*. Even Ewald admits, p. 485, notwithstanding his rejection of "healers," that the Essenes were known to the *people* chiefly as *physicians*.

among which Jerusalem—where a "gate of the Essenes" remained until the destruction of the city—must have been originally included; but to a much larger extent—according to Philo, exclusively—in the retirement of the villages, on account of the immorality of the towns. That they founded towns and villages of their own, as Hilgenfeld supposes, is incapable of proof.[1] We can still trace their development, the history of their gradual withdrawal from society, by the places in which they dwelt: from Jerusalem into the provinces, from the towns into the villages, finally from the villages into the deserts, wandering to and fro until they settled as hermits in the deserts, where, in the days of Jesus, John lived, and in the youth of Josephus (A.D. 50) the penitent Banus, and where Pliny, who dedicated his work to Titus in A.D. 77, recognized the Essene colonies among the date-palms near the town of Engaddi (En-gedi), on the west side of the Dead Sea. Ewald, exactly reversing the order and thus contradicting history, represents the Essenes as living first in the desert and then gradually establishing themselves in the towns.[2]

The Essenes are, in any case, of a so strongly marked Jewish type, that an explanation of them must certainly be sought, in the first place, in Judaism, and not in any Greek school. On this point Ritschl, and afterwards Hilgenfeld, were justified in differing from Zeller, who—justly, from his own standpoint—judged of them from the ground of Greek philosophy. Ewald, Grätz, Jost, and Herzfeld, have derived them from Judaism, and

[1] Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* p. 876 : Παλαιστίνη καὶ Συρία, ἣν πολυανθρωποτάτου γένους τῶν Ιουδαίων οὐκ ὀλίγη μοῖρα νέμεται. The proposed reading, Πάλ. Συρίας, is refuted by the passage itself. Epiphanius speaks of Samaritan Essenes, *Haer.* 1, 5. Herzfeld, III. p. 598. Comp. *B. J.* 2, 8, 4, and Philo, *Ap. p. Jud.*, ap. Eus. *Præp. ev.* 8, 11. Hilgenfeld, p. 259.

[2] Nation, Jos. *B. J.* 2, 8, 2 ; Philo, p. 876. Number, *ib.* p. 876 ; Jos. *Ant.* 18, 1, 5. Places of residence, πόλεις, πόλεις τάγματος, ἐν ἑκάστῃ πολλοί, Jos. *B. J.* 2, 8, 4. Gate of the Essenes, *B. J.* 5, 4, 2. Country life, κωμηδὸν οἰκοῦσι, τὰς πόλεις ἐκτρεπόμενοι, Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* p. 876. Also in Jos. *Ant.* 18, 1, 5 (agriculture). Banus in the desert, Jos. *Vita*, 2. Engaddi, Pliny, *Hist. nat.* 5, 17 : Socia palmarum. Infra hos Engadda oppidum fuit. Ewald, IV. pp. 483 sqq.

more precisely—again with justice—from Pharisaism. Essenism is connected with Pharisaism, not only by the name of Chasidim (the pious), which is common to both, and is very frequently applied to the Essenes; but yet more by a Levitical, sacerdotal striving after purity, and by a theology beginning with the universal interposition of God, with divine fate, and ending with eternal life, the consolation of the martyrs. The reputation for brotherly love is also common to both. Their teaching and practice were full of purity, purification, and the different degrees of purification; but not only was the priestly character—which has of late been proved, often with violence enough, chiefly by Ritschl—possessed by their leaders, whom they looked upon as the offerers of sacrifice, but every individual, by taking part in the sacrifices and purifications—which they compared with, and far preferred to, the Jerusalemitic *cultus*—obtained the standing of a priest, and Philo is full of their resemblance to priests.[1] With these visible points of contact between the Essenes and the Pharisees, which Herzfeld and Grätz have illustrated by a series of striking details, and with this undeniable tendency of thought towards a priesthood, it is as superfluous as it is incapable of proof, to bring—as Ewald, Grätz, and Herzfeld have done—the Essenes into connection with the Nazarites: the question as to the cause of their separation from the Pharisees, though capable of only a surmised solution, is of much greater moment. The facts of the case at once suggest the surmise that, together with the growing corruption of the commonwealth as a whole—at the head of which stood the

[1] Chasidim, see Grätz, pp. 81, 85, 88, 467. Purity, *καθαροὶ*, *B. J.* 2, 8, 5; comp. *Ant.* 18, 1, 5 : *διαφορότης ἁγνειῶν* (opp. *θυσίαι*). Philo, *Vita cont.* p. 877 : *ἡ παρ' ὅλον τὸν βίον συνεχὴς ἁγνεία.* Priests, comp. the expressions, *ἱερεῖς, ποίησις ἱερῶν* (sacrificing), *λειτουργία ἱερά, ἱεροπρεπὴς, ἱερὸν οἴκημα, σεμνεῖον, ἅγιον τέμενος, παρασπόνδια, παραβώμια, προσόδια.* Express comparison with the priests and the temple, *αἰδὼς ἱερᾶς τραπέζης*, Philo, *Vita cont.* p. 902. *νηφάλια, ὡς τοῖς ἱερεῦσι θύειν, καὶ τούτοις βιοῦν ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος ὑφηγεῖται* (comp. *τὰ ὅμοια ζηλοῦν, ib.*). Comp. the washing after relieving nature, *B. J.* 2, 8, 9; the priests obliged to do the same, *Joma*, 28 *a*, in Herzfeld, p. 389. Faith in *εἱμαρμένη*, Jos. *Ant.* 13, 5, 9; 18, 1, 5. Immortality, see below.

decaying, modern, crafty, weak Asmonæans, then the Herodians or Romans, and fatuous priests—the stereotyping of Pharisaism into theoretical dogma, the development of a new hierarchy of teachers in the midst of the people, and finally the worldly and ambitious policy of the Pharisees, gave occasion to a new movement which with greater strictness and purity expressed the original principle of a "pure life" and of priestly virtue among "the laity." The Essenes themselves recognized Pharisaism as antecedent to Essenism, while the Pharisees held the Essene to be a Chasid or Chaber who had become foolish.[1]

The essential characteristic of their priesthood was a distinctly marked legalistic piety. "Towards the Deity they are to an altogether peculiar degree pious. Next to God, they reverence most the name of the Lawgiver." Whoever spoke against the latter, or the national ordinances, was punished with death. They could not be induced, by any of the mortal dangers and tortures of the Jewish war, to dishonour him by a word, or to recognize the emperor as their master.[2] They observed the Sabbath more strictly than any other Jews. They made the necessary preparations on the previous day, in order to avoid lighting a fire on the Sabbath; on that day, they did not dare to remove a vessel from its place; they even refrained from relieving nature, whilst, on ordinary days—obedient to the Law in the most minute particulars (Deut. xxiii. 12, &c.)—they buried their excrement in the earth in some remote spot.[3] They strictly

[1] Comp. Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* p. 879 : *ἀρετὴ ἐν τοῖς πλήθεσι.* Relation to the Pharisees, Grätz, pp. 84 sq. ; Herzfeld, pp. 388 sqq.; Jost, pp. 207 sqq. Yet the Essenes may have later appropriated much from the Pharisees. Herzfeld manifestly contradicts himself when (p. 369) he describes the Essenes as ultra-Pharisaic, and then again (pp. 388 sqq.) as not standing in connection with the Pharisees. Ewald takes them to be pious men who have separated themselves from the ambitious hypocrites (Pharisees), IV. p. 483. Others also (Hirsch) think that the Essenes had their origin in the conflicts between the Pharisees and Sadducees. Herzfeld, p. 399.

[2] In this they approach the Zealots, with whom in fact Hippolytus confounds them (*Phil.* 9, 26).

[3] *B. J.* 2, 8, 5 : *πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἰδίως θεοσεβεῖς.* Again, *ib.* 2, 9, 10. Philo, p. 877. Individual instances of their strict observance of the Law, in the Talmud; comp. Herzfeld, III. p. 373.

observed also the laws of meats, and heroically resisted the temptations of their enemies in the Jewish war. At a later date (beginning of the third century) Hippolytus informs us that they used no coinage whatever, since it was unlawful to carry, look upon, or make an image; and that they even avoided going into the towns in order that they might not have to pass the statues on the gates.[1] Though they refrained from frequenting the temple—from which indeed they were excluded because they did not offer sacrifice—and though they refrained from sacrifice because they greatly preferred their own purifications, yet they recognized the hierarchy of Jerusalem in a certain sense, and sent their sacred gifts thither.[2]

This rejection of sacrifice points to a radical separation from the very Mosaism to which they were at the same time in servile bondage. But it was an important feature of Mosaism itself, viz., the Levitical striving after purity, which led to this breach. The Mosaic distinction between the pure and the impure was, as Pharisaism had already shown, capable of infinite exaggeration: the Essenes cut the world in two by this distinction, which took out of the hands of God one half of all existence. From God can good alone come, nothing that is evil. The world of matter is impure, evil. God, and the world of angels, whose names are known and honoured, soar far above matter. The human soul, formed of the subtilest ether, also belongs to this higher grade of existence; but it has been drawn, by a magical attraction, into connection with matter, and is imprisoned in the fetters of the impure body. Yet these fetters do not last for ever; matter is not enduring, the body is perishable, the soul immortal and eternal. The soul that is loosed from the bondage of the flesh will, like a captive rejoicing in deliverance from long servitude, soar upwards to a life above the ocean, where there is neither heat, nor snow, nor rain, but where there is light, and where the

[1] *Philos.* 9, 26.

[2] Laws of meats, *B. J.* 2, 8, 10. Sacred gifts, *Ant.* 18, 1, 5. Recognition of the hierarchy, comp. Philo, *De vita cont.* p. 902.

refreshing west wind blows from the sea; but, on the other hand, godless souls sink under the earth into caves of darkness and cold with endless torments. This hope sustained the martyrs in the Jewish war. They laughed under torture, they derided their executioners, they breathed forth their souls with joy, to win them back again. With their doctrine of the soul, says Josephus, they irresistibly fascinate those who have once tasted of their wisdom.[1]

The same fascinating doctrine was also the strength of their asceticism, of their renunciation of the world, of which martyrdom was only the perfection. Deliverance from matter was the grand problem of Essenism, however mockingly and Sadducaically the Pharisee might object that they could not, with all their purifications, invoke God, since they always carried their impure bodies about with them.[2] They did not, however, reject all matter. They received plain bread and clear cold water with thanksgiving as the gifts of God. They purified themselves with water for the service of God. They regarded light with special reverence, as the pure ethereal element. Hence their remarkable and quite unscriptural sun *cultus*. They addressed their prayers to heaven before sun-rise, at the same time begging the sun to arise.[3] The Therapeutæ of Egypt did the same, after the nocturnal worship of the seventh Sabbath. They were careful during the day not to do dishonour to the pure "beams of God;" hence they concealed their excrement in the earth. Speech and

[1] Only good from God, Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* p. 877 (comp. James i. 13, 17). Matter (ὕλη), the soul, its imprisonment, immortality, *B. J.* 2, 8, 10, 11. A somewhat different account of their eschatology, *Philos.* 9, 27. Here light is also mentioned (εἰς ἕνα χῶρον εὔπνουν καὶ φωτεινόν). In this account there is not wanting in particular the more Pharisaic doctrines of the resurrection of the body and of the burning of the world. Until the resurrection, the soul rests (ἀναπαύεσθαι) in that happy place. More details concerning the Jewish eschatology will be given below, in connection with the teaching of Jesus. Comp. Herzfeld, III. pp. 301 sqq.; Langen, l. c.

[2] Grätz, p. 85.

[3] Jost, p. 211: adoration of the sun cannot be thought of. Also Herzfeld, p. 408; Langen, pp. 244 sq.; Uhlhorn, l. c. p. 176. On the sun-service of the Essenes, comp. also the Sampsæans (Ἡλιακοί) of Epiphanius, *Haer.* 53, 2. Hase, Church History, 9th ed. 1867, p. 80.

labour began with the sun-rise; the darkness ended both the day and the "philosophy" of the Therapeutæ. Their philosophy, they said, was worthy of the light; to the darkness belonged the bodily necessities. Hilgenfeld's assertion that the night, the time of revelations, was specially sacred to them, is false. Nor is Herzfeld justified in supporting his belief in a nocturnal worship of the Essenes by appealing to the daily and nightly ablutions of the hermit Banus, who is representative of no one but himself. The contemporary Therapeutæ regarded the Sabbath and the seventh Sabbath as pure, virginal, eternally virginal, those days deriving this character from light and from number.[1] By the aid of the pure elements, men were to deliver themselves from what was impure, to discover what was good for soul and body, and to steep themselves in the ether of the Divine Being.[2]

The Essenes, therefore, restricted themselves to such attention to the body as was absolutely necessary. "Enjoyment is vice, abstinence is virtue." Their abstemiousness permitted, besides bread and water, at most some vegetable, or, as among the Therapeutæ, salt and hyssop. Luxurious dishes would only excite sensual desires. Their table was innocent of that which had blood, of flesh, which they would have regarded as impure on account of its having been begotten; hence they refrained also from animal sacrifice. Wine was prohibited as the drink of folly. They preferred to dress like priests, in white, luminous garments; the white mantle was prescribed for divine worship, but when at work they also preferred to wear a white under-dress, especially in summer, while in winter the Therapeutæ covered themselves with shaggy skins.[3] They were so frugal in clothing

[1] God, *χορηγὸς τροφῆς*, *B. J.* 2, 8, 5. *ὕδωρ διαυγέστατον, ψυχρὸν*, Philo, *Vita cont.* p. 900; Jos. *Vita*, 2. The sun: *ὥσπερ ἱκετεύοντες ἀνατεῖλαι*, *B. J.* 2, 8, 5. *πρὸς τὴν ἕω στάντες*, *Vita cont.* p. 903. *τὰς αὐγὰς τοῦ θεοῦ ὑβρίζειν*, *B. J.* 2, 8, 9. *φιλοσ. ἀξία φωτὸς σκότους σωματικαὶ ἀνάγκαι*, *Vita cont.* p. 894. *ἑβδομὰς ἁγνὴ καὶ ἀειπάρθενος*, p. 899. Philo here mainly appeals to the significance of numbers.

[2] *ὠφέλεια ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος*, *B. J.* 2, 8, 6.

[3] The principle, *B. J.* 2, 8, 2. Food, *B. J.* 2, 8, 5; Philo, *Vita cont.* pp. 895, 900, 902. *ὄψα πολυτελῆ*, *ib.* p. 900. *ἡ τράπεζα καθαρὰ ἐναίμων*, *ib.* *οἶνος*

and shoes, that they did not lay them aside until they were in rags. They refrained from anointing themselves with oil, and even washed the oil away when anointed against their will; they considered it not only luxurious, but also uncleanly.[1] They avoided marriage. According to Josephus and Philo, they did not absolutely condemn marriage, but they dreaded the strife and contention, the unfaithfulness, pride, and sensuality of women, who do not easily remain faithful to one man. One branch of the Essenes, indeed, accepted marriage. But even this party was rigorous in principle, and yielded in practice only because they believed that celibacy threatened the extinction of the human race. The betrothed women had to undergo a long three-years' probation, with purifications; and the procreation of children was the sole aim of conjugal intercourse. But the great body of the Essenes preferred a schism to making this concession; the Therapeutæ scarcely tolerated unmarried and for the most part elderly virgins—the left (woman) together with the right (man). All this was evidently founded on the general belief which is found similarly in Philo: Woman is sensuality; and procreation, conception, birth, are defilement and entanglement with matter. "Higher than mortal children are the immortal," the offspring of the God-loving soul into which the Father has poured spiritual light.[2] They were still more averse to the possession of material wealth. "They accumulate no treasure of gold or silver, nor acquire great estates for the sake of revenue; but they confine their gains to the necessities of life. They,

φάρμακον ἀφροσύνης, *ib.* νῆψις, *B. J.* 2, 8, 5. Clothing: λευχειμονεῖν διαπαντὸς ἐν καλῷ τίθενται, *B. J.* 2, 8, 3. This is not overthrown by the fact that the σκεπάσματα λινὰ, *B. J.* 2, 8, 5, were worn for lustrations and the sacred meals; and Philo mentions, *Vita cont.* p. 895, ἐξωμὶς ἡ ὀδόνη (linen) as the summer raiment, and in winter χλαῖνα παχεῖα ἀπὸ λασίου δορᾶς.

[1] *B. J.* 2, 8, 3. The αὐχμεῖν here may be explained either, they like to be rough, or, to be dry (Hilgenfeld).

[2] Pliny, 5, 17: Gens sine ulla femina. ὑπεροψία γάμου, *B. J.* 2, 8, 2. The more moderate party, *ib.* 2, 8, 13. Philo, *De vit. cont.* p. 899: γυναῖκες, ὧν πλεῖσται γηραιαὶ, παρθέναι τὴν ἁγνείαν. ἀθανάτων ἐκγόνων ὀρεχθεῖσαι ἀντὶ θνητῶν.

almost alone among men, hold those to be richest who are destitute of money and possessions; and consider ease and competency to be, what it is, superfluity."[1] Such was the position of these hermits in the world, every hour tearing themselves loose from the world by sentiment, act, and ablution, which not only preceded every mention of God's name, but accompanied even the most innocent actions.[2] How unclean was the world, when ablution was necessary not only after contact with the Gentiles, but even after contact with an inferior brother of the order! They laboriously worked their way out of the world of discord, out of the antithesis of light and darkness, day and night, man and woman, right and left, only, unhappily, ever to begin the task again until the deliverer, death, came.[3]

The severe and abstemious habits of the Essenes not merely prolonged their lives (Josephus speaks of many who were more than a hundred years old, and Philo of grey-haired virgins), but, what was of more importance to them, these things brought them into communion with God. Raised into fellowship with God, the Therapeutæ saw and enjoyed the Longed-for, into whose presence divine love rapt them in Corybantic ecstasy; they imagined their mortal life to be lost in the sweetness of a blessed immortality; even in sleep they looked upon the divine beauty, and in dreams uttered the mysteries of philosophy. The Essenes also, by means of purifications and of ancient sacred books—among which were not only the Prophets, but also the books of healing and exorcism ascribed to Solomon—penetrated into the nature of God and of angels, whose hidden names they knew and interpreted, revealing them, however, to the inferior members of the order only in symbol and allegory. For they, like Philo, dis-

[1] *Q. o. p. l.* p. 877. πλούτου καταφρονηταὶ, Jos. *B. J.* 2, 8, 3.

[2] Comp. the ἀπολούεσθαι, *B. J.* 2, 8, 9, 10. Concerning Banus, Jos. *Vita*, 2: *often*, by day and night: πολλάκις πρὸς ἁγνείαν.

[3] The antithesis of right and left: at meals, men on the right, women on the left, Philo, *Vita cont.* p. 899. The right hand between breast and beard, the left on the side, *ib.* p. 894. Spitting to the right forbidden, *B. J.* 2, 8, 9.

tinguished in the Holy Scriptures a body and a soul, into the nature of which latter only the congenial spiritual human soul could look through the glass of the letter. Hence, even a philosophy of the Essenes is spoken of, and of a preference for ethics over logic and physics, yet rather, strictly speaking, of a philosophy without Greek terms. They saw into the future, in their predictions concerning which they were seldom—their teacher of soothsaying, Judas, never—mistaken. They—as Simon, for example—interpreted dreams; they healed the sick by means of herbs and minerals, under the guidance of their ancient books; they expelled the devil, using the forms of exorcism ascribed to Solomon; and Onias, the weather-maker, even compelled the heavens to put an end to the curse of drought and to give rain.[1] The fact has not been noticed, that the author of the Christian book of the Revelation exhibits a trace of Essenism, which indeed is not wanting in other parts of the New Testament.[2]

Yet Essenism rises in our estimation far above the level of a mere system of purifications with magical results, when we remember that it penetrated not merely into the inner meaning of mysterious names, but also into the spirit of the Law and the Prophets. In the former case, it was only Pharisaism exaggerated into folly; in the latter, it was the prophet and reformer of the age. The duality of the Law and the Prophets here assumed a far greater importance than among the Pharisees. Their youth were educated in both, and were taught to value not only the prophecies, but also the morality of the prophets. We can the

[1] Philo, *Vita cont.* pp. 891, 893. Jos. *B. J.* 2, 8, 6, 7, 10, 12. Soothsaying, also in *Philos.* 9, 27: *ἀσκεῖται δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ προφητεύειν καὶ προλέγειν τὰ ἐσόμενα.* Symbols, allegories, Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* p. 877; *De vita cont.* pp. 893, 901. Jos. *B. J.* 2, 8, 6. Their philosophy, Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* pp. 877, 878. Jellinek has, without meeting with approval, referred the Book of Jubilees, and also the Book of Noah, to the Essenes, Langen, pp. 85 sqq. Comp. also above, the passages on Judas, Menahem, and Simon; also Grätz, pp. 84 sqq., 469.

[2] Comp. Rev. xiv. 4, the *παρθένοι, οἳ μετὰ γυναικῶν οὐκ ἐμολύνθησαν*; the *λευκοί*, vii. 14, &c.; the *λουτρόν*, i. 5, vii. 14, xxii. 14; the rejection of the altar of blood-sacrifice, xi. 1 sq.; the *πτωκοί*, ii. 9; the figures of light, water, metals, *e.g.* xxi. sq.; also xxii. 2. Further as to the New Testament, see below.

better reconcile ourselves to many of their purifications, because they are bound up with the morality of the prophets.[1]

"To enter into righteousness is considered by them to be worth every struggle and effort." "In choosing and rejecting they have three things in view: the love of God, the love of virtue, the love of man."[2] Moreover, they referred all acts back to the intention, and wrestled for victory over the passions, over lust and anger. The rejection of animal sacrifice was founded not merely upon the impurity of flesh. "They sacrifice no animals, but they long to make their sentiments such as are worthy of a priest." Their disposition exhibited itself in truthfulness of speech. They could not lie. Their word was said to be of more value than an oath, which they avoided out of reverence for the holy and mysterious God. An oath appeared to them worse than perjury, for the man who was not to be believed without oath was condemned already. They compelled Herod the Great to absolve them from taking an oath, before he did it for the Pharisees.[3] And further, the occupation of their lives was not a mere negative withdrawal from society. Their daily labour was thoroughly wholesome: they cultivated the land (fundamentally differing from the Rechabites on this point), they were shepherds and bee-masters, while some followed peaceable trades; none, however, were makers of weapons, although when journeying they carried arms as a protection against robbers; and all commerce, sea-faring, shop-keeping, everything that might lead to evil or to covetousness, was avoided by them.[4] On entering the order they promised, by a formula—which, from its insisting upon socially useful

[1] *νόμος καὶ προφῆται*, Philo, *De vita cont.* p. 893. *προφητῶν ἀποφθέγματα*, Jos. *B. J.* 2, 8, 12.

[2] Jos. *Ant.* 18, 1, 5. Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* p. 877: *φιλόθεον, φιλάρετον, φιλάνθρωπον.*

[3] Animal sacrifice, Philo, *ib.* p. 876; *De vita cont.* p. 900. Oaths, Jos. *B. J.* 2, 8, 6; Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* p. 878; *De vita cont.* p. 895. Herod, Jos. *Ant.* 15, 10, 4, 5. *θυμοῦ καθεκτικοὶ*, &c., *B. J.* 2, 8, 2, 3, 6.

[4] Industrial occupations, Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* p. 877. Bearing of arms, *B. J.* 2, 8, 4. They have been compared to the Rechabites (Jer. xxxv.).

activity, may be referred back to earlier, less separatist times —that they would above all serve God piously, and that they would, in the next place, be just toward all men, would injure no one, either at the command of others or from their own impulse; that they would hate the unjust, would make common cause with the just, would keep their word to all, especially to those in authority, since no one could obtain rule unless it was ordained of God. If they themselves rose to authority, they promised never to exercise power arrogantly, nor to surpass those who were under them either in clothing or in any kind of costly display; they would ever love the truth and seek to convict liars, and would keep their hands pure from theft and robbery, and their souls from unholy gains.[1] They practised the most perfect frankness in their intercourse with their fellow-members, and were more affectionate than any other men; they held, indeed, their possessions in common. They ministered to the aged with the filial care of sons and daughters. They possessed no slaves, and slavery was to them an abomination of injustice, contrary to God and to nature, since our common mother created and nourished all as blood-related brothers, and only malignant avarice burst asunder the bond of kindred, and converted relationship into estrangement, love into enmity.[2] But they also recognized the duty of love toward those that were without; subject to their superiors in everything else, they were free in two things—in aiding others, and in compassion.[3]

Their piety was crowned by the rare fact of a remarkably close and compact community. The Essenes formed a league of virtue (*Tugendbund*) in the highest sense of the word. As a rule, many of them lived together.[4] They performed acts of piety among

[1] *B. J.* 2, 8, 7. Hilgenfeld (p. 261) arbitrarily makes "those that are in authority" refer to the officers of the order.

[2] φιλάλληλοι τῶν ἄλλων πλέον, *B. J.* 2, 8, 2. Behaviour of the young towards the old, especially Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* p. 878; *De vita cont.* p. 900. Slaves, *Ant.* 18, 1, 5; Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* p. 877; *De vita cont.* pp. 899 sq.

[3] *B. J.* 2, 8, 6: δύο ταῦτα παῤ αὐτοῖς αὐτεξούσια, ἐπικουρία καὶ ἔλεος.

[4] *B. J.* 2, 8, 4.

and towards each other. The characteristic and fundamental law of the society was communism. "Mine and thine belong to thee." An admirable community of goods, says Josephus, existed among them, and none among them could be found who possessed more than the others; it was a law that the entering members should make over their property to the society. Hence there was seen nowhere among them either the misery of poverty or the splendour of riches, for by the community of goods they became like brothers possessed of one common property.[1] They lived, however, in separate houses, and by no means, as Herzfeld supposes, in one house or in a convent together; each man pursued his special calling, and had a right to support himself by his trade, and to do good to others by providing them with food, though this might not be done to relatives without special permission. They also bartered necessaries with each other, but without buying and selling; a thing could, however, be obtained from a brother without barter. Essenes from a distance, to whom it was forbidden to take anything with them on their journey, entered the house of their entertainer as if it were their own. But whatever was gained by husbandry and trade passed into the general fund.[2]

Such a community of goods strictly observed was possible only to a piety that filled every individual with a burning zeal to separate himself from the world at any price, and to live as a celibate and without property. Communism was here the right means to adopt in order to have nothing, and yet to retain something for urgent necessities and offices of love and compassion. A *strict and rigid organization* was, however, also needed to keep

[1] *B. J.* 2, 8, 3. Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* p. 878.

[2] *B. J.* 2, 8, 4—6. Grätz, p. 81; Herzfeld, p. 369, &c. The account given by Josephus (*B. J.* 2, 8, 4), like that given by Philo (*Q. o. p. l.* pp. 877 sq.), points everywhere to separate dwellings; and indeed only by that means could the relative independence of the individual be ensured. The manner of life among the Therapeutæ also points to the same custom. Though Philo speaks of an ὁμωρόφιον, a common roof (p. 878), yet this everywhere refers to their assemblies. Among others, says Philo, there are no ὁμωρόφιον, ὁμοδίαιτον, ὁμοτράπεξον.

the extensive machinery of the society in order. The Essenes had (probably only for the individual districts) their presidents (Epimeletai, Epitropoi) in charge of the common property, and of the receipts and expenditure. These officers also had the oversight of the activity of the individual members, whom they sent out to their respective duties; and they exercised the right of decision as to the contributions of the individual members to their relations. Doubtless these "good men" were at the same time the officiating priests at divine worship and at the sacrificial meals. In every town of the order, there was a man appointed to take charge of the Essenes who came from a distance, to whom he had to assign clothing and the necessaries of life. There would also be special attendants on the sick. These officials would be the more readily obeyed as they were elected by the whole community. The general assembly, also, was superior to the presidents. In such an assembly there were always at least one hundred Essenes, against whose decision there was appeal. Age and the majority regulated the decision. Doubtless, the deciding assembly was composed only of men advanced in years.[1] There was, namely, a four-fold class division. The first class consisted of the novices, who were compelled to undergo a year's probation, during which they took no part in the ablutions and the meals, but were furnished each with the axe (for trench-digging), with the apron (for the washing of hands), and with the white garment. Notwithstanding the childlessness of the community, the lack of births, yet "the eternal people," as Pliny says, were never without the children of others, whom they reared for the order, or older persons who were weary of the world, and who here sought rest.[2] The second class consisted of approved novices, who were admitted into more intimate communion, and in particular were allowed to take part in the

[1] *B. J.* 2, 8, 3—9; *Ant.* 18, 1, 5.

[2] Pliny, *Hist. nat.* 5, 17: Gens sola, sine femina, omni venere abdicata. Ita per seculorum millia, incredibile dictu, gens æterna, in qua nemo nascitur: tam fœcunda illis aliorum vitæ pœnitentia est.

lustrations, but were not yet qualified to be present at the sacred meals. In this class they remained two years. The third consisted of those who were formally accepted, and who, as far as can be discovered, were young in age or in service, and were both youths and old men; while, finally, the fourth class was composed of such as had belonged to the order from early youth, and had acquired the greatest amount of Essene knowledge and experience.[1] It is very probable that the deciding assembly was composed only of this presbytery, this fourth class, the purest, who would be defiled by contact with the members of the inferior grades. Their function was the election of presidents and priests, as well as the receiving and expelling of members. Admission to membership, at the end of the third year, was accompanied with terrible vows, the only ones known among the Essenes. The new members were pledged to piety and uprightness; they swore to conceal nothing from their fellow-members, to reveal nothing to strangers even when threatened with death, to keep secret the books of the order and the names of the angels, and to accept unconditionally the doctrine which had been handed down. The more serious offences were punished by expulsion from the order, and this expulsion was more horrible than death. Oath and custom forbade the expelled to receive food from those who were not of the order. With no nourishment but the herbs of the field, and inwardly miserable, such wretched outcasts died of exhaustion; the most that the compassion of the community did for them was to alleviate their last sufferings by receiving them again at the point of death, when they had sufficiently atoned for their sins.[2]

We have yet to glance at the mode in which the Essenes

[1] *B. J.* 2, 8, 7, 10; also, especially, Philo, *De vita cont.* p. 899. Though, according to Philo, *Apol. p. Jud.*, ap. Eus. *Præp. ev.* 8, 11, only the τέλειοι ἄνδρες πρὸς γῆρας ἀποκλίναντες appear as accepted, yet this can have reference only to admission into the highest class, since both Josephus and Philo often speak of the younger members, and even of their presence at the meals. Contrary to Hilgenfeld, *Jüd. Apokalyptik*, p. 259.

[2] *B. J.* 2, 8, 7, 8. Thus Judas Maccabæus once lived in the desert, 2 Macc. v. 27.

divided the work of the day. Early in the morning, before sunrise, there was common prayer to the God of light. Then came separate occupations until the end of the fifth hour. At noon, they assembled—men and women—dressed in linen garments, for their ablutions in cold water. Thus purified, they repaired to the sacred house whose threshold no profane person, no novice, was allowed to cross: this was their temple, their place of sacrifice, the feasting-hall of their sacrificial meals. They entered silently, and over the food which each one brought (a loaf of bread, a mess, water), the priest uttered a prayer to God, the Giver of nourishment, thereby consecrating the food as a holy sacrifice.[1] The infirm, besides being relieved from labour, were favoured by the addition of hyssop and warm water, as well as by the filial services of the younger members. The meal was partaken of with but little noise, and thus the impression that there were awful mysteries within was produced on the uninitiated without. Only one might speak at a time; if ten sat together—the smallest number composing a sacred assembly, among the Pharisees also—one might not speak without the permission of the nine.[2] Probably, as among the Therapeutæ, questions were proposed, or a passage of Scripture explained. A prayer from the priest concluded the meal. The holy garments were then laid aside, and work began anew until dusk. At the evening meal, which was conducted in the same manner, foreign Essenes, who had arrived as guests, took part. The Sabbath was kept as a feast. All labour ceased, the people assembled in the synagogue—probably the same house as that used for the sacrificial meal—sitting with their faces towards the altar, the younger at the feet of the older. One read aloud passages from their laws, and the most experienced among them expounded, clothing what

[1] *ποίησις σίτου τε καὶ βρωμάτων*, *Ant.* 18, 1, 5.

[2] The ten, *B. J.* 2, 8, 9. Comp. *Pirke Abot*, III. 6: Ribbi Chelpheta dicit: Decem, qui una sedent et occupati sunt in discenda lege, divinitas quiescit inter eos, &c. Comp. the ten Chasidim in the desert, 2 Macc. v. 27. See also Herzfeld, II. p. 392.

was secret in symbols. The others listened silently, giving signs of approval or doubt only with the head, eye, or hand.[1]

The life of the Egyptian Therapeutæ was somewhat differently coloured. The Greek name fully corresponds to the Aramaic one of the Essenes.[2] It has been disputed whether the Essenes in the Holy Land, or the Egyptian Therapeutæ, had the better claim to originality; for it cannot be believed, either with Bellermann that they were identical, or with Neander that they were wholly independent of each other. The latest scholars have regarded the question as superfluous, since they hold Philo's treatise on the Therapeutæ to be spurious, and to be only a glorification of the commencement of Christian monachism in Egypt. But this opinion does great violence to history, for the treatise breathes not only the spirit of Philo, but also that of pre-Christian and indeed Essenic Judaism. It is not difficult to believe — and here Ritschl, Hilgenfeld, and Herzfeld, rightly differ from Gfrörer and Zeller—that the Egyptian type was an exaggerated, forced, and unhealthy development of the Palestinian phenomenon. Plainly, the exaggerated form grew out of the more moderate, rather than *vice versa*. The progress of Essenism itself, from the towns to the villages, and thence to the deserts, affords a means of dating the rise of the Egyptian hermits.[3]

[1] *B. J.* 2, 8, 5. Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* p. 877. Comp. ib. *De vita cont.* p. 901.

[2] Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* p. 876, identifies them with respect to the name, ἐσσ. = θεραπευταὶ θεοῦ. This does not prevent him, in *De vita cont.*, from regarding the Egyptian Therapeutæ as something specific.

[3] As to the various surmises, comp. Uhlhorn's article, *Essener*, in Herzog. Even Zeller (III. p. 583) follows Baur and Gfrörer in regarding the Therapeutæ as the original sect; Hilgenfeld and Ritschl justly take the opposite view. Dähne believes—as Philo did—in two branches from the one stem of Alexandrian philosophy and asceticism, the theoretical and the practical. On the other hand, again, Grätz (pp. 463 sqq.) holds the *De vita cont.* to be spurious. Even *Q. o. p. l.* is not genuine! The proofs—refuted by Herzfeld, III. p. 382—are extremely defective. One of the chief proofs is, the work speaks of a foregoing attack upon the Essenes, whilst in *Q. o. p. l.* scarcely one-twelfth treats of them. He thinks also that the Therapeutæ are plainly Christian monks. But where are the *Christian* features? The Therapeutæ are *Jews*, indeed sun-worshippers. They are distinguished from the first Egyptian monks also by their love of science.

The Egyptian Therapeutæ began with an absolute retreating from the world. Seized with a longing for a divine life, they left house and goods to their relations and friends, went away from parents, brothers, sisters, wives, and children, and, escaping from the corrupt life of the towns, settled in the solitude of the country. The greater number and the best lived by the lake Mareotis, to the south of Alexandria. When Philo, in one place, speaks of their diffusion throughout the world, he exaggerates, or rather he confounds the Jewish hermit-life with similar phenomena among the Greeks and barbarians.[1] The Therapeutæ lived not far apart from each other, yet each in his own little house, his sanctuary, his cell. Throughout the week they lived alone, not stepping over the threshold, not even looking out. They did not work, nor have we have any information as to ablutions among them. They prayed at dawn and in the evening twilight; during the day they studied their sacred books, and composed songs and hymns in various metres. They were the theorists, while those who lived in the Holy Land were men of practical life. The former were philosophers even by night and in their dreams.[2] Yet practice was not wanting. None ate until night, many fasted for three days, some for six; only on the seventh day, the Sabbath, did they all moderately provide for the body. That was also the day of meeting in the common sanctuary. The men and women sat divided by a partition; one of the oldest and most experienced addressed the meeting. The seventh Sabbath, the fiftieth day, the eternally virgin-day, was

[1] This leads Grätz (p. 465) to think of Christian monks, who were widely diffused at an early date (as early as the time of Eus., or indeed of Philo?). But has not Philo frequently enough compared the Therapeutæ and the Essenes to the Gymnosophists and the Magi, to the philosopher Calanus, and to Anaxagoras and Democritus? Moreover, Josephus has compared the Essenes to the Daci and Polistæ. *Ant.* 18, 1, 5.

[2] On this Hilgenfeld (p. 267) bases his assertion that the *night* was held specially sacred by the Essenes. This is incorrect, in the first place because Philo is speaking only of the Therapeutæ; but it also contradicts all the fundamental facts. Josephus, *B. J.* 2, 8, 5, says that they do not discourse of secular matters before sunrise: this, however, is no evidence of the sacred character of the night, but only of the necessity of sanctifying life by morning prayer. Comp. above, p. 373.

regarded as the most sacred. They came together dressed in white garments, joyful but dignified; at a given signal from the president of the day (Ephemereutes) they stood up, and, with hands and eyes lifted towards heaven, they prayed that the sacrificial meal might be well-pleasing and acceptable. The older men reclined upon a litter of papyrus, and the worthiest youths waited upon them, but without any badge of servitude. They partook of leavened bread (avoiding the unleavened bread of the temple), salt, hyssop, and water. Everything was done quietly—one almost feared to draw breath. The Scripture was explained, and questions were answered. When the discourse met with approbation, it was applauded at its close. The president then raised a hymn—either of his own composition, or an old one—others followed him, and the whole company joined in the chorus. The table was removed, and the sacred solemnities of the night began. Two choirs of men and women with their choir-leaders stepped forward, singing first together and then alternately, with movements and gestures. At the height of the solemnity, the two choirs united themselves into one, and in their divine fervour emulated the triumphant song of Moses and Miriam. At dawn they turned their body and their eyes towards the East; and as the sun rose, they lifted their hands towards heaven, greeted one another with wishes for a happy day, for truth, and for spiritual discernment, and returned contentedly to their solitude, the friends of God, men who had attained the height of bliss.[1]

Could such a community as that formed by the Essenes have been *purely Jewish?* This question here meets us afresh. We are still able to answer: Essenism is wholly intelligible from the standpoint of Judaism. Everything is either Mosaic, or a possible consequence of Mosaism. Everything is either prophetic, or a consequence of prophetism. It would be easy to show how the striving after righteousness, the conception of the priesthood, of the purifications, could have been based upon the Law and the

[1] See the whole treatise, *De vita contemplativa.* Comp. Herzfeld, III. pp. 509 sqq.

Prophets, and especially upon the interpretation of them in later Judaism; or how the demand for truthfulness without oath, piety without sacrifice, the love of one's neighbour even to community of goods and rejection of slavery, and the hope of immortality—how all this could have been developed out of the prophets. Even their symbolical worship of the sun, and their very name, point to the prophets. Let us recall a passage of Isaiah's: "Is not *this* the fast that is more pleasing unto me, that ye loose the bands of wickedness, that ye strip off the cord of the yoke, that ye let the oppressed go free, and break every yoke? That thou deal thy bread to the hungry, and bring the destitute into thy house? When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him, and hide not thyself from thine own flesh? Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily; thy righteousness shall go before thee, the glory of Jehovah shall be thy rereward." But how many other passages must occur to us—the numerous passages against sacrifice without the worship of the heart, and exhortations to serve with the heart and with love; especially the short saying of Hosea's, soon to be heard again from the mouth of one who was greater than he: "I desire mercy, not sacrifice"![1] Looking beyond Palestine, there is much—and precisely that which is most enigmatical—in Essenism which can be explained as due to the influence of Philo's theology, a theology by no means wanting in features borrowed from Greece, and particularly from the Pythagorean philosophy; on which account Gfrörer, Dähne, and others, have thought of that philosophy as explanatory of Essenism. In fact, the dualism of the Essene view of the universe, the allegorical interpretation of the Scripture, and much besides, including the worship of the sun, can be fully explained out of Alexandrianism. Philo calls the sun and stars the visible gods, and says: Marvel not that the sun, by all the rules of allegory, is likened to the Father and Leader of all; though in truth nothing is like God, yet in the opinion of man two things only are—a visible

[1] Isaiah lviii. 6 sqq., lx. 20; Hosea vi. 6.

and an invisible: the invisible, the soul (man, according to Moses, is an image of God); the visible, the sun.[1] Thus again Josephus, a man of Hellenistic culture, and indeed, at the same time, a disciple of the Essenes, calls the allowing the dead to be "exposed to the sun" an offence against God. The fourth book of the Maccabees, written in the first Christian century, also dwells much upon light.[2]

The facts of Essenism, in themselves, afford no urgent reasons for assuming any Greek influence, not to speak of Persian.[3] Such urgent reasons first make their appearance when we remember the historical fact that there was an earlier parallel upon Greek soil. The principles of the Essenes come into contact, in a host of instances, with the views of the school of Pythagoras, who, according to his biography by Jamblichus, had passed from Egypt into the Holy Land, and had been upon Carmel, the mount of Elijah. Zeller has pointed out in detail their great points of resemblance, and Herzfeld their differences.[4] In both

[1] *De somn.* p. 576: *μὴ θαυμάσῃς δὲ, εἰ ὁ ἥλιος κατὰ τοὺς ἀλληγορίας κανόνας ἐξομοιοῦται τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ἡγεμόνι τῶν συμπάντων. Θεῷ γὰρ ὅμοιον πρὸς ἀλήθειαν μὲν οὐδὲν, ἃ δὲ δόξῃ νενόμισται, δύο μόνα ἐστὶν, ἀόρατόν τε καὶ ὁρατὸν, ψυχὴ μὲν ἀόρατον, ὁρατὸν δὲ ἥλιος.* That Philo might himself be called a Pythagorean, see above, p. 284. Hilgenfeld (p. 273) adduces proofs from the Book of Enoch (*Hen.* 100, 10) that elsewhere in Judaism controlling power was ascribed to the stars. But, according to Dillmann's explanation, these and other passages merely represent the stars as witnesses of human actions.

[2] *B. J.* 4, 6, 3; comp. Langen, p. 246. Concerning 4 Macc. (*e. g.* § 17), *ib.* pp. 75 sqq.

[3] Hilgenfeld, *Das Judenthum im pers. Zeitalter, Zeitschr.* 1866, p. 408. Fortunately, however, he speaks only of a "breath." But the date at which the party took its rise at once forbids this fresh hypothesis; the worship of the sun is otherwise explained; the doctrine of immortality has Greek models. And celibacy and fasting cannot come from the Persians (comp. pp. 403 sq.). Besides the Persian elements in Essenism, Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschrift*, 1867, pp. 97 sqq.) finds traces of Buddhism in Essenism and Jesus. But what avail the industriously collected details, if the organic unity cannot be restored, nor the chasm bridged over except by the previous and very precarious assumption of an admission of Buddhism into Alexandria (p. 105), when after all everything can be otherwise explained?

[4] Jamblichus, *Vita Pyth.* c. 3; comp. Jos. *Con. Ap.* 1, 22. Brought into relation with the Pythagoreans also by Baur, Bellermann, and Frankel; also Herzfeld, pp. 369 sqq., 400 sqq. Comp. below.

we find an ascetic habit of life, a rejection of flesh, wine, marriage, and the sacrifice of animals; white garments, purifications, a sacerdotal type, moral life without oaths and without slavery; an organization with different grades; silence, mysteries, belief in a divine destiny and in intermediate beings; adoration of the sun; retreat from the world, and a belief in immortality; allegory, sacred numbers, magic, and soothsaying. An historical hypothesis may be based upon such direct analogies. The credibility of such an hypothesis lies simply in the historical impossibility that two phenomena, in complete independence, should have produced, on Greek and Jewish soil, a long and uninterrupted series of like characteristics, many of the characteristics being in detail very accidentally connected with each other. It is impossible not to see that this hypothesis throws a fuller light upon many features of Essenism: as, for example, upon the theory of the nature and the future of the human soul, which is expressed altogether in Greek formulæ; upon the worship of the sun, which Philo, notwithstanding what he wrote, never observed; upon the rejection of oaths and of slavery; and upon communism —all of them principles which neither Philo nor the prophets ever expressed so roundly. This hypothesis also enables us to do more justice to the letter of Josephus. That author has not only described the Essene hope of immortality, very differently from that of the Pharisees, as Hellenistic; but he has spoken of Essenism as a whole as possessing—and here he is speaking not merely, as in the case of Pharisaism, by way of comparison—Greek resemblances, and he frankly asserts: They are a class of men who follow the mode of life which Pythagoras taught among the Greeks.[1] In fact, not only has a Baur or a Zeller affirmed this dependence, but Ewald, Herzfeld, Langen, Lutterbeck, and at last even Ritschl, while justly maintaining that Essenism

[1] *Ant.* 15, 10, 4: *γένος δὲ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ διαίτῃ χρώμενον τῇ παρ' Ἕλλησιν ὑπὸ πυθαγόρου καταδεδειγμένῃ.* Quite unlike the Pharisees, *Vita*, 2: *παραπλήσιός ἐστι τῇ παρ' Ἕλλησι στωϊκῇ λεγομένῃ* (*αἱρέσει*); or comp. *Ant.* 18, 1, 5, fin.

was rooted in Judaism, have not excluded foreign influences.[1] Whether the school—which, Herzfeld notwithstanding, relates nothing about a founder—was originally based on Greek principles, or, which is more probable, only appropriated Greek elements by way of supplement; whether it derived these elements from Syria, or, as is generally believed (by Langen also), from Egypt, perhaps through Palestinian Jews, who owed their culture to Alexandria—these are questions which remain as obscure as the fate of the Pythagorean school itself, which, disappearing about B.C. 300, was again visible towards the end of the Roman republic. The Syrian and not Egyptian residence of the Essenes, their active intercourse with Syria at the time of their rise, as well as the fact that the practice of greeting the rising sun was there customary, and was even adopted by the Roman legions, lead us to think first of Syria; while Egypt is suggested by the actual and demonstrable relation between Essenism and the Jewish philosophy in Egypt.[2] Thus much is unmistakable: Essenism is a noteworthy, almost incredible, evidence of the susceptibility of the Jewish mind to foreign influences, of its need of complement; for almost immediately after the war of revolt against the Syro-Greek culture, the ideas of this foreign world thrilled through the very heart of the Holy Land and penetrated the deepest Pharisaic strata of the nation. But yet more is it the representative of the enduring tenacity and power of resistance of the Hebrew genius, a genius which permanently assimilated only congenial elements, interwove them with the very core of Old Testament piety, until the different threads

[1] Comp. Ewald, *Gesch. Volks Israel*, IV. pp. 419 sqq. Lutterbeck, *Neutest. Lehrbegriffe*, I. p. 271. Langen, l. c. pp. 191 sqq. Already Hermes, 1721: Essæos non fuisse Judæos, sed philosophos barbaros judaizantes. Ritschl, *Altkath. Kirche*, 2nd ed. p. 179. Hilgenfeld, p. 246. Herzfeld, III. pp. 368 sqq., 404: Eclecticism. He thinks of a founder who, about B.C. 220, emigrated from Judæa to Alexandria, and returned, after having acquired much knowledge (ib. B.C. 200; p. 406, B.C. 170).

[2] Tac. *Hist.* 3, 24: Undique clamor: et *orientem solem* (ita in Syria mos est) tertiani *salutavere*.

could not be distinguished, and then, by means of this strong texture, created such a flourishing community of pious and upright men, as the repeatedly disorganized, languishing, moribund Pythagorean school could never become.

Essenism is plainly an extremely remarkable phenomenon of the ancient world. Philo, and even Josephus the Pharisee, were enthusiastic in its praises. There is no end of their laudation of the good men, the athletes of virtues, the friends of God, the blessed; of the realization by these men of the righteousness which was so little cultivated by Greeks and barbarians; of the love which was unexampled even among the Jews; of the community of goods which had been praised rather than practised by others; of their virtuous habits, which seemed altogether impossible to others. Philo and Josephus have both very visibly made use of their ideas. Even the sceptical Roman, Pliny, betrays sympathy and emotion when he describes the men "weary of the world," who had in some sort conquered the sorrow of humanity which he himself had so deeply experienced. How many moderns, including Ewald, have called the Essenes the noblest fruit of the old religion![1] Essenism carried both Judaism and heathenism beyond their respective limitations, by formally organizing a league of virtue for the pious of the whole world. This piety of the individual, which can compare with the morality of the best ages, and this common life of a pious society existing through centuries, were simply without parallel. The external arrangements were so intelligent and so elaborately organized, that they may be placed by the side of the most perfect monastic constitutions of Christian times. But that we have here less a new principle vigorously forcing itself upon the world, than the languishing patient of a sick age, laboriously though praiseworthily struggling to ward off death by genuinely Jewish

[1] Comp. Jos. *Ant.* 18, 1, 5; *B. J.* 2, 8, 2. Philo, *Q. o. p. l.* pp. 878, 879. Josephus may be said to have been dependent upon them, especially as to his doctrine of immortality. *B. J.* 3, 8, 5, accords better with Essene than with Pharisaic doctrine. Pliny, 5, 17: Vita fessi. Comp. above, p. 381. Ewald, IV. p. 490.

means, is seen in the bleeding rent between flesh and spirit, in the terror which recoiled from the impurity of the material world, in the mechanism of compulsory action, destroying all individuality and carving every figure after a stiff and stereotyped pattern, making them, as Josephus well says, mere schoolboys under the rod of the master; we see it also in the resistance to any further development, in the rigid conservatism which kept the old sacred dogmas intact, and finally and specially in the withdrawal, as a secret confederate community, from the wider social life of Judaism.[1] When we estimate the influence of this order upon the nation, it can hardly be said to have been either important or beneficial on a large scale, notwithstanding its favourable effect upon individuals. Essenism was in reality only a confession of helplessness against the actual state of things, a renunciation of all attempts to re-construct a united Israel—a united Israel being to the Essenes "heterodox" and "unclean." It was thus a breach with the very life of the nation, with the secret of its undying national power—its sense of unity and solidarity; it was an act of despair, the beginning of dissolution. The salvation of the individual in the general shipwreck is, in plain language, the watchword of this party. We never hear from them the cry of the kingdom of God, or the Messiah cry—for the kingdom of God, in the highest degree, was confined within their own borders. Essenism left the nation to its fate; only at the last moment, led by John the Essene, it joined the Zealots, in striking a blow to save Zion. But after the fall of Zion, it was able to prolong its days in the wilderness of the Dead Sea; and could even put forth fresh blossoms, as if its life were not affected by the death of the nation.[2]

[1] *Ant.* 18, 1, 5: *ζῶσι δὲ οὐδὲν παρηλλαγμένως. B. J.* 2, 8, 4: *καταστολὴ δὲ καὶ σχῆμα σώματος ὅμοιον τοῖς μετὰ φόβου παιδαγωγουμένοις παισί.* Hilgenfeld, p. 264, overlooks the main point of the passage, since he makes it mean simple as schoolchildren.

[2] "The proclamation of the kingdom of heaven undoubtedly began with the Essenes" (Grätz, p. 476). This statement is altogether without foundation; as is also the opinion of Staüdlin, Kuinöl, Venturini, and recently Mangold (*Irrlehrer der Pastoralbriefe*, p. 124) and Langen (p. 457), that they expected a Messiah; according

Thus Essenism affords a test by which we can discover how much strength and nobility still remained in that decaying pre-Christian humanity, and how much spiritual material that humanity could contribute to the new principle which was destined truly to bring healing to the world. Its weaknesses, however, teach us that the salvation which rose, a new, creative, fructifying power, upon the nation and the world, was not the product of either the influence or the forces of Essenism.

to Staüdlin and Kuinöl (out of respect for the Baptist and Jesus), one indeed who should suffer. There is no trace of all this; at most, Grätz can only surmise the existence of Essenes among the prophets and Messiahs at the time of the catastrophe. Philastrius, *Haer.* 9 (the Essenes expect a man as Messiah), is an obscure, late source. The Essenes who were converted to Christianity were the first who had the Messiah. We find absolutely no Essene predictions of the kingdom and of the Messiah; this fact is intelligible, because, notwithstanding the prophets, they, in their sectarian self-sufficiency, did not need to look for a national redemption. The Essenes in the war, *B. J.* 2, 8, 10; 2, 40, 4; 3, 2, 1. Already in the beginning of the war, *John the Essene* is prominent as general, *B. J.* 2, 20, 4; 3, 2, 1. The increase of ascetics who ate no flesh and drank no wine, and lived in the deserts, after the destruction, *Tosifta Sota*, 15, in Herzfeld, III. p. 384. Essenes still flourishing in the time of Hegesippus (Eus. 4, 22) and Justin (comp. *Tryph.* 80), even of Hippolytus (*Philos.* 9, 18—27). Christianity also exhibits largely Essenic elements. Comp. besides the traces in the Gospels (see below, John, Jesus), and in the Revelation (see above, p. 377, note 2); Acts iv. 34; Rom. xiv. 2; Coloss. ii. 18; James i. 17, 19, 26, 27, ii. 1 sqq., iii. 6 sqq., v. 12, &c. James, in the legend, Eus. 2, 23. Matthew, above, p. 91. Comp. also the Ossenes, Elkesaites, and Sampsæans of Epiph. Hence Eusebius' (see above, p. 15) and Jerome's recognition of themselves in the Essenes and Therapeutæ of Philo, in whose mode of life was found that of the Jerusalemite primitive community of the Acts of the Apostles, and by Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 8, 11) also the genuinely apostolic life of the monks.

SYNOPSIS

OF THE CONTENTS AND PLANS OF THE OLDER GOSPELS AS FAR AS THE ENTRY OF JESUS INTO JERUSALEM.

PART I.

The Preliminary History of the Messiah.

Sect. I.—THE MESSIAH-CHILD.

Matthew.	Luke.	Mark.
	Preface, i. 1—4.	Preface, i. 1.
	1. Annunciation of Elizabeth's son, in Judæa, i. 5—25.	
	2. Annunciation of Mary's son, at the Galilean Nazara, i. 26—38.	
	3. Salutation of the holy mothers, i. 39—56.	
First Narrator.		
1. Genealogy of Jesus, i. 1—17.	4. Birth and growth of John, i. 57—80.	
Second Narrator.		
2. Birth of Jesus in his home, Judæa and Bethlehem, i. 18—25.	5. Birth of Jesus on the journey for enrolment at Bethlehem, ii. 1—7.	
	6. Adoration of the shepherds, ii. 8—20.	
	7. Circumcision of Jesus, presentation in the temple, homage paid him there, ii. 21—38.	
	8. Return to the Galilean home, Nazara, ii. 39, 40.	
3. Adoration of the two-years-old child by the Magi, flight into Egypt,		

Matthew.	Luke.	Mark.
slaughter of the children, return, settle in the Galilean Nazara, ii. 1—23.		
	9. Jesus in the temple when twelve years old, ii. 41—52.	

Sect. II.—THE CONSECRATION OF THE MESSIAH.

Matthew.	Luke.	Mark.
First Narrator.		
1. Appearance of John at the Jordan, iii. 1—12.	1. Time of John's appearance, his ministry, imprisonment, iii. 1—20.	1. Appearance of John at the Jordan, i. 2—8.
2. Jesus baptized by John, iii. 13—17.	2. Jesus baptized by John, iii. 21, 22.	2. Jesus of Nazara baptized by John, i. 9—11.
	3. Genealogy of Jesus, iii. 23—38.	
3. The temptation of the Messiah, iv. 1—11.	4. The temptation of the Messiah, iv. 1—13.	3. The temptation of the Messiah, i. 12, 13.

PART II.

Historical Ministry of the Messiah.

A.—THE PREACHING OF THE KINGDOM BY THE GALILEAN MESSIAH.

Matthew.	Luke.	Mark.
Sect. I. *Commencement of ministry* (after John's apprehension), iv. 12—ix. 34.	Sect. I. *Commencement of ministry*, iv. 14—vi. 11.	Sect. I. *Commencement of ministry* (after John's apprehension), i. 14—iii. 6.
1. Return to Galilee, settlement in Capernaum, beginning of the proclamation of the kingdom, iv. 12—17.	1. Return to Galilee. Inaugural sermon at Nazara, on the fulfilment of the Scriptures, anti-Jewish; tumult, departure to Capernaum, iv. 14—32. (v. 1 sqq.) (vi. 12 sqq.)	1. Return to Galilee, the Gospel of the fulfilment of the Scriptures, and of the approach of the kingdom of God, i. 14, 15.
2. The first calling of disciples, iv. 18—22.		2. The first calling of disciples, i. 16—20. (iii. 7 sqq.)
3. Mission, assembling of the people. The great Sermon on the Mount, iv. 23—vii. 29.		

Matthew.	Luke.	Mark.
4. The ten great miracles: The leper. The Centurion's servant. Peter's mother-in-law. Embarking (followers) and storm. Two possessed Gadarenes. Paralytic at Capernaum (ix. 1). Interlude: calling of Matthew the publican; at meat in publican's house; controversy with the Pharisees and the disciples of John. Resuscitation of the ruler's daughter. The woman with the issue of blood. Two blind men. The dumb demoniac, viii. 1—ix. 34.	2. The four great miracles: The demoniac. Peter's mother-in-law, and Jesus' assiduity. Peter's draught of fishes and its results. The leper, iv. 33—v. 16.	3. The three great miracles: The demoniac in Capernaum. Peter's mother-in-law; Jesus' great assiduity. The leper, i. 21—45.
	3. The four deadly conflicts: The paralytic. The calling of Levi the publican; at meat with publicans, and controversy with Pharisees (publicans, fasting). First Sabbath controversy, occasioned by the plucking of the corn. Second Sabbath controversy, occasioned by the healing of the man with the withered hand, v. 17—vi. 11.	4. The four deadly conflicts: The paralytic. The calling of Levi the publican, the son of Alphæus; at meat with publicans, and controversy with Pharisees. First Sabbath controversy, occasioned by the plucking of the corn. Second Sabbath controversy, occasioned by the healing of the man with the withered hand, ii. 1—iii. 6.
Sect. II. *Mission of the twelve Apostles. The kingdom in conflict and coming*, ix. 35—xii. 50.	Sect. II. *Choice of the twelve Apostles, great miracles, great conflicts*, vi. 12—vii. 50.	Sect. II. *Choice of the twelve Apostles. Conflict with the Pharisees. The true Messiah-circle*, iii. 7—35.
1. The necessities of the people; the twelve; Jesus' great missionary address, ix. 35—x. 42.	1. The twelve Apostles, and the Sermon on the Mount, vi. 12—49.	1. The great concourse of people; the selection of the twelve, iii. 7—19.
	2. Two miracles:	

Matthew.	Luke.	Mark.
(viii. 5 sqq.)	*a.* The centurion's servant, vii. 1—10.	
	b. The young man of Nain, vii. 11—17.	
2. Conflicts and revelations:	3. Conflicts and revelations:	
a. Conflict with John and the people:		
α. John's Messiah question, xi. 1—6.	*a.* John's Messiah question, and Jesus' declarations concerning John-Elijah, vii. 18—28.	
β. Declarations concerning John-Elijah, xi. 7—15.		
γ. Denunciation of the people, xi. 16—24.	*b.* Jesus' denunciation of his contemporaries, especially the Pharisees, vii. 29—35.	
δ. The Son's thanksgiving for partial success, xi. 25—30.	(x. 21 sqq.)	
b. Four conflicts with the Pharisees:	*c.* Simon the Pharisee and the woman that was a sinner; the two debtors, vii. 36—50.	
α. First Sabbath controversy (the ears of corn), xii. 1—8.	(vi. 1 sqq.)	(ii. 23 sqq.)
β. Second Sabbath controversy (the withered hand), xii. 9—14.		
[A reflection of the interpolator's, xii. 15—21.]		
γ. The accomplice of Beelzebub, rather the Founder of the already come kingdom, xii. 22—37.	(xi. 14 sqq.)	2. The reproach of being assisted by Beelzebub, iii. 20—30.
δ. The demand for signs, xii. 38—45.	(xi. 16, 29 sqq.)	
3. The true Messiah-circle (mother and brethren), xii. 46—50.	(viii. 19—21).	3. The true Messiah-circle (mother and brethren), iii. 31—35.
Sect. III. *The glories of the kingdom of God. Parables. Misunderstandings. Miracles,* xiii. 1—xiv. 36.	Sect. III. *The glories of the kingdom of God. Parables. The true family. Great miracles,* viii. 1—55.	Sect. III. *The glories of the kingdom of God. Parables. Great miracles. Misunderstandings,* iv. 1—vi. 6.

Matthew.	Luke.	Mark.
1. The seven parables of the kingdom of heaven, spoken on the shore and in the house: the productive seed, the sower, the mustard-seed, the leaven, the treasure, the pearl, the net, xiii. 1—52.	1. The two parables of the productive seed and the light, spoken by the way, viii. 1—18.	1. The five parables of the productive seed, light, measure, the seed growing of itself, the mustard-seed, spoken on the shore, iv. 1—34.
	(xiii. 18 sqq., x. 23 sq.)	
2. The despised and suspected Messiah:	2. The true Messiah-circle (mother and brethren), viii. 19—21.	
a. The unsuccessful sermon at Nazara, xiii. 53—58.	(iv. 16 sqq.)	(vi. 1 sqq.)
b. The suspicion of the tyrant, the murderer of the Baptist, xiv. 1—13.	(ix. 7 sqq.)	(vi. 14 sqq.)
3. The miracles during the flight: Feeding the 5000. Storm and passage over the lake. Miracles of healing at Gennesaret, xiv. 14—36.	3. The four great miracles: The storm. The Gerasene demoniac. Jairus' daughter. The woman with the issue of blood, viii. 22—56.	2. The four great miracles: The storm. The Gerasene demoniac. Jairus' daughter. The woman with the issue of blood, iv. 35—v. 43.
(xiii. 53 sqq.)	(iv. 16 sqq.)	3. The unsuccessful sermon at Nazara, vi. 1—6.
Sect. IV. *Decisive struggle with the Pharisees. Retreat of Jesus. Peter's confession of the Messiah at Cæsarea Philippi*, xv. 1—xvi. 20.	Sect. IV. *Mission of the Apostles. Bread for many. Peter's confession of the Messiah. The suffering and the glorified Messiah*, ix. 1—50.	Sect. IV. *Mission of the Apostles. The attention of Antipas drawn to Jesus; the death of the Baptist. Bread for many. Storm, crossing the lake, and miracles of healing*, vi. 7—56.
(x. 1 sqq., xiv. 1 sqq.)	1. Short missionary address. The saying of Antipas concerning Jesus and John. Return of the Apostles, ix. 1—10.	1. Short missionary address. The saying of Antipas. His murder of John. Return of the Apostles, vi. 7—30.
(xiv. 14 sqq.)	2. Feeding the 5000 (symbolical), ix. 11—17.	2. Feeding the 5000. Storm and passage over the lake. Miracles of healing in Gennesaret, vi. 31—56.

Matthew.	Luke.	Mark.
		Sect. V. *Attack upon the ordinances of the Pharisees. The last great deeds*, vii. 1—viii. 26.
1. The great attack upon the ordinances of the Pharisees, xv. 1—20.		1. The great attack upon the ordinances of the Pharisees, vii. 1—23.
2. Retreat towards Tyre and Sidon. The Canaanite woman, xv. 21—28.		2. Four great miracles: *a.* Healing of the possessed daughter of the Canaanite woman (Syro-Phœnician), vii. 24—30.
		b. The deaf mute in Decapolis, vii. 31—37.
3. Return to the lake. Feeding the 4000, xv. 29—39.		*c.* Feeding the 4000, viii. 1—9.
4. The Pharisees and Sadducees require signs. Return over the lake. Warning against adversaries, xvi. 1—12.	(xii. 54 sqq.)	*d.* Sign refused (warning against the Pharisees and Herod Antipas), viii. 10—21.
		e. The blind man at Bethsaida, viii. 22—26.
		B. The proclamation of the Messiah, of his passion and of his glory. The fatal journey, viii. 27—xiii. 37.
		Sect. I. *The confession of the Messiah. Proclamations of suffering and glory on the last Galilean journey*, viii. 27—ix. 50.
5. Arrival in the N.E., in Cæsarea Philippi. Test of public opinion. Peter acknowledges Jesus to be the Messiah; Jesus' promise, xvi. 13—20.	3. Test of public opinion. Peter acknowledges Jesus to be the Messiah, ix. 18—20.	1. Arrival at Cæsarea Philippi. Test of public opinion. Peter acknowledges Jesus to be the Messiah. . . . .

Matthew.	Luke.	Mark.
B. The Messiah's Proclamation of his passion. The fatal journey, xvi. 21—xxv. 46.		
Sect. I. *Proclamations of suffering and glory, on the last Galilean journey,* xvi. 21—xviii. 35.		
1. First announcement, at Cæsarea Philippi. Peter protests. Warning to followers. The Messiah will come again, xvi. 21—28.	4. Proclamation of suffering and glory. Warning to followers. The kingdom in sight, ix. 21—27.	Jesus' first announcement of suffering. Peter protests. Warning to followers. The kingdom in sight, viii. 27—ix. 1.
2. The meeting of Jesus with Moses and Elijah on the Mount of Transfiguration. Contemporary incapacity of the disciples when left to themselves (the lunatic), xvii. 1—21.	5. The meeting of Jesus with Moses and Elijah on the Mount of Transfiguration, ix. 28—36.	2. The meeting of Jesus with Moses and Elijah on the Mount of Transfiguration, ix. 1—13.
3. Second saddening announcement, xvii. 22, 23.	6. Four-fold incapacity of the disciples: The lunatic. Failure to understand the second announcement of suffering. Dispute as to who should be greatest in the kingdom of God. Intolerance towards the caster-out of devils, ix. 37—50.	3. Four-fold incapacity of the disciples: The lunatic. Failure to understand the second announcement of suffering. Dispute as to who should be greatest in the kingdom of God. Intolerance towards the caster-out of devils, ix. 14—40.
4. The Messiah condescends to pay the didrachma; the miracle of the fish, xvii. 24—27.		
5. Who are great in the kingdom of God; the regulations of that kingdom, xviii. 1—35.		4. Regulations of the kingdom of God, ix. 41—50.
	B. The passion-journey to Jerusalem, ix. 51—xxi. 37.	

Matthew.	Luke.	Mark.
	Sect. I. *The journey through Galilee, Samaria, and Judæa*, ix. 51—xviii. 30.	
	1st *Stage: Commencement of the journey*, ix. 51—x. 37.	
	a. The inhospitable Samaritan village. Intolerance of the sons of Zebedee, ix. 51—56.	
Comp. viii. 19—22.	*b.* The followers, ix. 57—62.	
Comp. ix. 37 sqq., xi. 20 sqq. 25 sqq., xiii. 16 sqq.	*c.* Selection, mission, and success of the seventy Apostles of the Gentiles. Triumph and thanksgiving of Jesus, x. 1—24.	
Comp. xxii. 34 sqq.	*d.* The good Samaritan, a typical fulfiller of the highest commandment, x. 25—37.	Comp. xii. 28 sqq.
	2nd *Stage: Addresses to friend and foe*, x. 38—xiii. 21.	
vi. 9 sqq., vii. 7 sqq.	*a.* Assembly and prayer. Martha and Mary. Prayer enforced by parable, x. 38—xi. 13.	
xii. 22 sqq. 38 sqq., xxiii. 1 sqq. Comp. v. 15, vi. 22 sqq.	*b.* Denunciation of the men of that generation, and of the Pharisees, xi. 14—54.	iii. 22 sqq., viii. 11, ix. 40, iv. 21 sqq.
	c. Admonitions to the disciples and the people:	
x. 1 sqq. (comp. xvi. 6, xii. 32).	*α.* Address of instruction to the disciples, xii. 1—12.	viii. 15, iv. 22, iii. 29, xiii. 11.
	β. Warning to the people against the accumulation of earthly treasures (the husbandman), xii. 13—21.	

Matthew.	Luke.	Mark.
vi. 25—33, xxiv. 43 sqq., x. 34 sq.	γ. Admonition to the disciples to take no thought for earthly things and to be prepared for the Lord, xii. 22—53.	
xvi. 2 sqq., v. 25 sqq.	δ. Concluding admonitions to the people, xii. 54—xiii. 9.	
Comp. xiii. 31 sqq.	*d.* Putting the adversaries to shame (the crooked woman, the kingdom of God), xiii. 10—21.	iv. 30—32.
	3rd *Stage: The narrow way*, xiii. 22—xvii. 10.	
vii. 13, 21 sqq., viii. 11 sq. Comp. xix. 30, xx. 16.	*a.* The future exclusion of the Jews from the kingdom of God (few saved; sanguinary purposes of the adversaries; doom pronounced over Jerusalem), xiii. 23—35.	x. 31.
xxiii. 37 sqq.		
xxii. 1 sqq.	*b.* At meat in the Pharisee's house (Miracle of healing. Rules for guests. The feast in the kingdom of God. The way of self-denial), xiv. 1—35.	Comp. ix. 50.
x. 37 sqq. Comp. v. 13.		
xviii. 12—14.	*c.* The Saviour of the lost, in antithesis to Pharisaic pride. The three parables of the lost sheep, the lost drachma, the lost son, xv. 1—32.	
vi. 24.	*d.* Riches and poverty: *α.* Parable of the unrighteous steward, xvi. 1—13.	
Comp. xi. 12, v. 18, 32.	*β.* Parable of the rich man, xvi. 14—31.	Comp. x. 11 sqq.
Comp. xviii. 6, 7, 15, xvii. 20.	γ. Final admonitions to the disciples (duty to neighbours, duty	ix. 42.

Matthew.	Luke.	Mark.
	of humility), xvii. 1—10.	
	4th *Stage: The kingdom of God*, xvii. 11—xviii. 30.	
	a. The ten lepers. The one, a Samaritan, saved by grateful faith, xvii. 11—19.	
	b. The coming of the kingdom of God:	
xxiv. 17 sqq. Comp. x. 39.	*a.* Surprises and separations, xvii. 20—35.	xiii. 21, viii. 35.
	β. Importunate prayer to the delaying Lord (parable of the widow), xviii. 1—8.	
	c. Sentiments illustrative of the kingdom:	
Sect. II. *Entrance into Judæa*, xix. 1—xx. 16.		Sect. II. *Entrance into Judæa*, x. 1—31.
1. Controversy with the Pharisees concerning divorce, xix. 3—12.	*a.* Pharisees and publicans, xviii. 9—14.	1. Controversy with the Pharisees, concerning divorce, x. 2—12.
2. The children, xix. 13—15.	*β.* The children, xviii. 15—17.	2. The children, x. 13—16.
3. The rich young man, xix. 16—26.	*γ.* The rich ruler, xviii. 18—27.	3. The rich man, x. 17—27.
4. The prospective fruits of the self-denial of the Apostles, xix. 27—30.	*δ.* The prospective fruits of the self-denial of the Apostles, xviii. 28—30.	4. The prospective fruits of the self-denial of the Apostles. The first and the last, x. 28—31.
5. Parable of the first and the last, xx. 1—16.	(xiii. 30.)	
Sect. III. *Near Jerusalem*, xx. 17—34.	Sect. II. *Near Jerusalem*, xviii. 31—xix. 27.	Sect. III. *Near Jerusalem*, x. 32—52.
1. Third explicit announcement of death, on the way to Jerusalem, xx. 17—19.	1. Third explicit announcement of death, on the way to Jerusalem. Fulfilment of Scripture. Misunderstanding of the disciples, xviii. 31—34.	1. Third explicit announcement of death, on the way to Jerusalem. Jesus as hero before his alarmed disciples, x. 32—34.
2. Petition of the mother of Zebedee's sons, that they may sit on the right hand and on the		2. Petition of the two sons of Zebedee to sit on the right hand and on the left. Dispute among

Matthew.	Luke.	Mark.
left. Dispute among the disciples, xx. 20—28.		the disciples, x. 35—45.
3. The two blind men, on the departure from Jericho, xx. 29—34.	2. The blind man, before the entry into Jericho, xviii. 35—43. 3. Progress through Jericho, entertained by the believing, penitent chief publican Zacchæus, xix. 1—10. 4. Preparative parable to remove the misconception that the entry into Jerusalem would be followed by the immediate setting up of the kingdom. The nobleman going to a far country to receive a kingdom. The ten servants entrusted with money, and the rebellious subjects. Reward and punishment, on the return, xix. 11—27.	3. Blind Bartimæus, on the departure from Jericho, x. 46—52.
(xxv. 14 sqq.)		(xiii. 34 sqq.)
Sect. IV. xxi. 1—xxv. 46. Entry into, and ministry in, Jerusalem.	Sect. III. xix. 28—xxi. 38. Entry into, and ministry in, Jerusalem.	Sect. IV. xi. 1—xiii. 37. Entry into, and ministry in, Jerusalem.

C.—DEATH AND RESURRECTION.

Matthew.	Luke.	Mark.
xxvi. 1—xxviii. 20.	xxii. 1—xxiv. 53.	xiv. 1—xvi. 8 (20).
Last announcement of death, on the threshold of the passion, xxvi. 1, 2.		

Printed by C. Green & Son, 178, Strand.

Catalogue of some Works

PUBLISHED BY

WILLIAMS & NORGATE.

Ali. Life of Mohammed. A Critical Examination of the Life and Teachings of Mohammed, from a Mohammedan Standpoint, including Chapters on Polygamy, Slavery, Moslem Rationalism, Moslem Mysticism, &c. By Syed Ameer Ali, Moulvie, M.A., LL.B., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law, &c. Crown 8vo. cloth 9*s.*

Apocryphal Gospels, and other Documents relating to the History of Christ. Translated from the Originals in Greek, Latin, Syriac, with Notes. References, and Prolegomena. By B. Harris Cowper. Third Edition. 8vo. cloth 6*s.*

Baur (F. C.), Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ, his Life and Work, his Epistles and his Doctrine. A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity. Edited by E. Zeller. Translated by Rev. Allan Menzies. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth 21*s.*

Beard (Rev. Chas.), The Soul's Way to God, and other Sermons. Preached in Liverpool by Charles Beard, B.A., Author of "Port Royal, or Contribution to the History of Religious Literature in France." 7*s.* 6*d.*

Beard (Rev. Chas.), Port Royal, a Contribution to the History of Religion and Literature in France. Cheaper Edition. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 12*s.*

Beard (Rev. Dr. J. R.), The Autobiography of Satan. Crown 8vo. cloth 7*s.* 6*d.*

Bible for Young People. A Critical, Historical, and Moral Handbook to the Old and New Testaments. By Dr. H. Oort and Dr. J. Hoykaas, with the assistance of Dr. Kuenen. Translated from the Dutch by the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed. Vol. I. Introduction and the Generations before Moses, 4*s.* Vol. II. From Moses to David. With Map. Crown 8vo. cloth 5*s.*

Belsham (T.), Memoirs of the late Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, M.A. The Centenary Volume. 8vo. cloth 5*s.*

Bleek (F.), Lectures on the Apocalypse. Edited by T. Hossbach. Translated from the German. Edited by Dr. S. Davidson. Complete in one volume, 8vo. cloth 10*s.* 6*d.*

Bouzique (E. U.), History of Christianity. Translated from the French by the Rev. Dr. Beard. 3 vols. crown 8vo. cloth 21*s.*

Channing and Lucy Aikin. Correspondence of William Ellery Channing, D.D., and Lucy Aikin, from 1826 to 1842. Edited by Anna Letitia Le Breton. Crown 8vo. cloth 9*s.*

Channing (Rev. Dr.), The Perfect Life. A Series of Unpublished Discourses of William Ellery Channing, D.D. Edited by the Rev. W. H. Channing. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Chastel (Rev. E.), Christianity in the 19th Century: a Religious and Philosophical Survey of the immediate Past, according to the Spirit of Jesus. Translated by the Rev. Dr. BEARD. Crown 8vo. cloth 5*s.*

Cobbe (Miss F. P.), The Hopes of the Human Race, Hereafter and Here. Essays on the Life after Death. With a Preface having special reference to Mr. Mill's Essay on Religion. By FRANCES POWER COBBE. 8vo. cloth 7*s.* 6*d.*

Cobbe (Miss F. P.), Essays. Darwinism in Morals, and (13) other Essays (Religion in Childhood, Unconscious Cerebration, Dreams, the Devil, Auricular Confession, &c. &c.). 400 pp. 8vo. cloth (pub. at 10*s.*) 5*s.*

Cobbe (Miss F. P.), Dawning Lights. An Inquiry concerning the Secular Results of the New Reformation. 8vo. cloth 5*s.*

Cobbe (Miss F. P.), Alone to the Alone. Prayers for Theists, by several Contributors. New Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth 5*s.*

Cobbe (Miss F. P.), Religious Duty. 8vo. cloth (published at 7*s.* 6*d.*) 5*s.*

Cobbe (Miss F. P.), Studies, New and Old, of Ethical and Social Subjects. 8vo. cloth (published at 10*s.* 6*d.*) 5*s.*

Davidson (Rev. Dr.), On a Fresh Revision of the English Old Testament. By SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D. Crown 8vo. cloth 5*s.*

Davidson (Dr. S.), An Introduction to the Old Testament, Critical, Historical, and Theological, containing a discussion of the most important questions belonging to the several Books. By SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D. 3 vols. 8vo. cloth 42*s.*

Echoes of Holy Thoughts: arranged as Private Meditations before a First Communion. Second Edition, with a Preface by the Rev. J. HAMILTON THOM, of Liverpool. Printed with red lines. Crown 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Ewald (Professor H.), Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament. Translated by the Rev. J. FRED. SMITH. Vol. I. Yoel, Amos, Hozea, and Zakharya, 9-11. (Being the 9th Volume of the Theological Translation Fund Library.) 8vo. cloth 10*s.* 6*d.*

Fellowes (Robert, LL.D), The Religion of the Universe, with Consolatory Views of a Future State, and suggestions on the most beneficial topics of Theological Instruction. Third Edition. Post 8vo. cloth 6*s.*

Flower (J. W.), Adam's Disobedience, and the Results attributed to it, as affecting the Human Race. Second Edition, enlarged and corrected. 8vo. cloth 6*s.* 6*d.*

Gould (S. Baring), Lost and Hostile Gospels. An Account of the Toledoth Jesher, two Hebrew Gospels circulating in the Middle Ages, and extant fragments of the Gospels of the first three Centuries of Petrine and Pauline origin. By the Rev. S. BARING GOULD. Crown 8vo. cloth 7*s.* 6*d.*

Hanson (Sir Richard), The Apostle Paul and the Preaching of Christianity in the Primitive Church. By Sir RICHARD DAVIS HANSON, Chief Justice of South Australia, Author of "The Jesus of History," "Letters to and from Rome," &c. 8vo. cloth 12*s.*

Higginson (Rev. E.), Ecce Messias; or, The Hebrew Messianic Hope and the Christian Reality. By EDWARD HIGGINSON, Author of "The Spirit of the Bible," "Astro-Theology," "Six Essays on Inspiration," &c. 8vo. cloth (pub. at 10*s.* 6*d.*) 6*s.*

Keim's History of Jesus of Nazara, considered in its connection with the National Life of Israel, and related in detail. Translated from the German by A. Ransom. Second Edition. Vol. I. 8vo. cloth 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— Vols. II. and III. in the press.

Kuenen (Dr. A.), The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State. By Dr. A. Kuenen, Professor of Theology at the University, Leyden. Translated from the Dutch by A. H. May. 3 vols. 8vo. cloth 31*s.* 6*d.*

Letters to and from Rome in the years A.D. 61, 62 and 63. Translated by C. V. S. Crown 8vo. cloth 2*s.* 6*d.*

Lindsay (Dr. James), The Analytical Interpretation of the System of Divine Government of Moses. Being the First Part of an Analytical Interpretation of the Pentateuch. 2 vols. cloth 6*s.*

Mackay (R. W.), The Tuebingen School and its Antecedents. A Review of the History and Present Condition of Modern Theology. 8vo. cloth 10*s.* 6*d.*

Mackay (R. W.), Progress of the Intellect, as exemplified in the Religious Development of the Greeks and Hebrews. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth 24*s.*

Mackay (R. W.), Sketch of the Rise and Progress of Christianity. 8vo. cloth (pub. at 10*s.* 6*d.*) 6*s.*

Man's Belief, A: an Essay on the Facts of Religious Knowledge. Crown 8vo. cloth 2*s.* 6*d.*

Martineau (Dr. Jas.), Modern Materialism: its Attitude towards Theology 1*s.* 6*d.*

Martineau (Dr. Jas.), Religion as affected by Modern Materialism 1*s.*

Muir (Dr. John), Religious and Moral Sentiments. Metrically rendered from Sanskrit Writers; with an Introduction and Appendix containing exact translations in Prose. Cloth 2*s.*

Multum in Parvo. Thoughts for every day in the Year. Selected from the Writings of spiritually-minded persons. By the Author of "Visiting my Relations." Crown 8vo. cloth 2*s.* 6*d.*

Reville (Rev. Dr. A.), The Song of Songs, commonly called the Song of Solomon, or the Canticle. Translated from the French. Crown 8vo. cloth 1*s.* 6*d.*

Reville (Rev. Alb.), The Devil: his Origin, Greatness, and Decadence. Translated from the French of the Rev. Albert Reville, D.D. 12mo. cloth 5*s.*

Samuelson (Jas.), Views of the Deity, Traditional and Scientific; a Contribution to the Study of Theological Science. By James Samuelson, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law, Founder and former Editor of the Quarterly Journal of Science. Crown 8vo. cloth 4*s.* 6*d.*

Spencer (Herbert), Social Statics; or the Conditions essential to Human Happiness specified, and the First of them developed. Cheaper Edition. 8vo. cloth 10*s.*

Spencer (Herbert), Essays, Scientific, Political, and Speculative. (Being the First and Second Series re-arranged, and containing an additional Essay.) Cheaper Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth 16*s.*

Spencer (H.), Descriptive Sociology; or Groups of Sociological Facts, Classified and Arranged. Compiled and Abstracted by David Duncan, M.A., Professor of Logic, &c. in the Presidency College, Madras; Richard Scheppig, Ph.D.; and James Collier. Folio, bds.

No. 1. English. By James Collier 18*s.*
No. 2. Ancient Mexicans, Central Americans, Chibchas, and Ancient Peruvians. By Dr. Scheppig 16*s.*
No. 3. Types of Lowest Races, Negritto Races, and Malayo-Polynesian Races. By Professor Duncan 18*s.*
No. 4. African Races. By Professor Duncan 16*s.*

Spencer (Herbert), Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical. 8vo. cloth 6*s.*

Strauss (Dr. D. F.), New Life of Jesus. The Authorized English Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth 24*s.*

Taine (H.), English Positivism. A Study of John Stuart Mill. Translated by T. D. Haye. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth 3*s.*

Taine (H.), The Philosophy of Art. By H. Taine. Crown 8vo. 3*s.*

Tayler (Rev. John James), Letters, embracing his Life, of John James Tayler, Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Biblical Theology, and Principal of Manchester New College, London. Edited by the Rev. John Hamilton Thom. 2 vols. in one, 8vo. Portrait. Cheaper Issue 10*s.* 6*d.*

Tayler (Rev. J. J.), An Attempt to Ascertain the Character of the Fourth Gospel, especially in its relation to the three First. New Edition. 8vo. cloth 5*s.*

Theological Review: A Journal of Religious Thought and Life. Published Quarterly. Each No. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.* Annual Subscription, post free, 10*s.*

Turpie. The Old Testament in the New: a Contribution to Biblical Criticism and Interpretation. The Quotations from the Old Testament in the New, Classified according to their Agreement with, or Variation from, the Original: the Various Readings and Versions of the Passages added, and Critical Notes subjoined (in a series of Tables), containing the Hebrew Text and Septuagint Version, and the Greek of the New Testament; with English Translation. By D. M'Calman Turpie, M.A. Royal 8vo. cloth 12*s.*

What do we Know? Eight Tracts on this Question. Leaves from the Writing-Desk of an old Student. Crown 8vo. cloth 3*s.* 6*d.*

Williams (Dr. Rowland), The Hebrew Prophets. Translated afresh, and Illustrated for English Readers. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth 22*s.* 6*d.*

—— Vol. I. The Prophets under the Assyrian Empire 10*s.* 6*d.*
—— Vol. II. The Prophets under the Babylonian Empire 12*s.*

Williams (Dr. Rowland), Psalms and Litanies, Counsels and Collects, for Devout Persons. By Rowland Williams, D.D., late Vicar of Broadchalke, sometime Senior Fellow and Tutor of King's College, Cambridge. Edited by his Widow. Library Edition. Fcap. 4to. cloth extra 12*s.* 6*d.*

Williams (Dr. Rowland), Broadchalke Sermon Essays. On Nature, Meditation, Atonement, Absolution. Crown 8vo. cloth 7*s.* 6*d.*

Zeller (Dr. E.), The Contents and Origin of the Acts of the Apostles critically investigated. Preceded by Dr. Fr. Overbeck's Introduction to the Acts of the Apostles from De Wette's Handbook. Translated by Joseph Dare. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth 21*s.*

14, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London;
20, South Frederick Street, Edinburgh.

CATALOGUE

OF

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE'S PUBLICATIONS.

Æschylus. Agamemnon. Greek Text revised and translated by John F. Davies, B.A. 8vo, cloth. 3*s.*

Ali (Syed Ameer) Life of Mohammed. A Critical Examination of the Life and Teachings of Mohammed, from a Mohammedan Standpoint, including Chapters on Polygamy, Slavery, Moslem Rationalism, Moslem Mysticism, &c. Crown 8vo, cloth. 9*s.*

Attwell (Professor H.) Table of Aryan (Indo-European) Languages, showing their Classification and Affinities, with copious Notes; to which is added, Grimm's Law of the Interchange of Mute Consonants, with numerous Illustrations. A Wall Map for the use of Colleges and Lecture-rooms. 2nd Edition. Mounted with rollers. 10*s.*

—— Table of the Aryan Languages, with Notes and Illustrations. 4to, boards. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Agnostic's Progress, An, from the Known to the Unknown. 268 pp. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5*s.*

Bannister (Rev. Dr. J.) Glossary of Cornish Names, Ancient and Modern, Local, Family, Personal, 20,000 Celtic and other Names in use in Cornwall. 8vo, cloth. 12*s.*

Barnabas' Epistle, in Greek, from the Sinaitic Manuscript of the Bible, with a Translation by S. Sharpe. Crown 8vo, cloth. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Barratt (A.) Physical Metempiric. By the late Alfred Barratt. With a Portrait. 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Barratt (A.) Physical Ethics, or the Science of Action. 8vo, cloth. 12*s.*

Baur (F. C.) Church History of the First Three Centuries. Translated from the Third German Edition. Edited by Rev. Allan Menzies. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 21*s.*

—— Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, his Life and Work, his Epistles and Doctrine. A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity. Translated by Rev. A. Menzies. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 21*s.*

Bayldon (Rev. G.) Icelandic Grammar. An Elementary Grammar of the Old Norse or Icelandic Language. 8vo, cl. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Beard (Rev. C.) Lectures on the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century in its Relation to Modern Thought and Knowledge. (Hibbert Lectures, 1883.) 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— Port Royal, a Contribution to the History of Religion and Literature in France. 2 vols. 8vo. 12*s.*

Bentham et Hooker Genera Plantarum, ad exemplaria imprimis in Herbariis Kewensibus servata definita; auctoribus G. Bentham et J. D. Hooker. Vol. I. 1, 16*s.*, I. 2, 10*s.* 6*d.* Vol. II. 56*s.* Vol. III. 56*s.* Imp. 8vo, cloth. Vol. I. Part 3, is out of print.

Bernstein and Kirsch. Syriac Chrestomathy and Lexicon. Chrestomathia Syriaca cum Lexico. 2 vols. in 1. 8vo, cloth. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Bible, translated by Samuel Sharpe, being a Revision of the Authorized English Version. 5th Edition of the Old Testament, 9th Edition of the New Testament. 8vo, roan. 4*s.* 6*d.*

—— vide also Testament.

Bible for Young People. A Critical, Historical, and Moral Handbook to the Old and New Testaments. By Dr. H. Oort and Dr. J. Hooykaas, with the assistance of Dr. Kuenen. Translated from the Dutch by the Rev P. H. Wicksteed. 6 vols. Crown 8vo. 20*s.*

Bisset (A.) Short History of the English Parliament. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 7*s.*

—— Notes on the Anti-Corn-Law Struggle. 8vo, cloth. 9*s.*

Bleek (F.) Lectures on the Apocalypse. Edited by Dr. S. Davidson. 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Cobbe (Miss F. Power) The Peak in Darien, and other Inquiries touching Concerns of the Soul and the Body. Crown 8vo, cloth. 7*s.* 6*d.*

—— A Faithless World. With Additions and a Preface. 8vo, cloth. 2*s.* 6*d.*

—— The Duties of Women. A Course of Lectures delivered in London and Clifton. 2nd Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5*s.*

—— The Hopes of the Human Race, Hereafter and Here. Essays on the Life after Death. With a Preface having special reference to Mr. Mill's Essay on Religion. 2nd Edition. Cr. 8vo. 5*s.*

—— Alone to the Alone. Prayers for Theists, by several Contributors. 3rd Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5*s.*

—— Broken Lights. An Inquiry into the Present Condition and Future Prospects of Religious Faith. 3rd Edition. 5*s.*

—— Dawning Lights. An Inquiry concerning the Secular Results of the New Reformation. 8vo, cloth. 5*s.*

Cobbe (Miss F. Power) Darwinism in Morals, and (13) other Essays (Religion in Childhood, Unconscious Cerebration, Dreams, the Devil, Auricular Confession, &c. &c.). 8vo, cloth. 5*s.*

Crawford (Rev. Dr.) Horæ Hebraicæ. Cr. 8vo, cloth. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Crowfoot (J. R.) Fragmenta Evangelica quæ ex antiqua recens. vers. Syriac. Nov. Test. a Curetono vulg. Græce reddita, &c. 2 Parts; and Observations, 1 Part. 4to. 20*s.*

Cureton (Dr. W.) History of the Martyrs in Palestine, by Eusebius, in Syriac. Edited and translated. Royal 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Dante's Inferno and Purgatorio. Translated into Greek verse by Mussurus Pasha, D.C.L. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. each 12*s.*

Davids (T. W. Rhys) Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion, as illustrated by some Points in the History of Indian Buddhism. (Hibbert Lectures, 1881.) 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Day (Dr. F.) The Fishes of Great Britain and Ireland; being a Natural History of such as are known to inhabit the Seas and Fresh Waters of the British Isles, including Remarks on their Economic Uses and Various Modes of Capture. 179 Plates. 2 vols. imp. 8vo, cloth. £5. 15*s.* 6*d.*

Delitzsch (Dr. F.) The Hebrew Language viewed in the Light of Assyrian Research. By Dr. Fred. Delitzsch, Professor of Assyriology at the University of Leipzig. Crown 8vo. 4*s.*

Dipavamsa, the: a Buddhist Historical Record in the Pali Language. Edited, with an English Translation, by Dr. H. Oldenberg. 8vo, cloth. 21*s.*

Echoes of Holy Thoughts: arranged as Private Meditations before a First Communion. 2nd Edition, with a Preface by Rev. J. Hamilton Thom. Printed with red lines. Fcap. 8vo, cloth. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Engelhardt (C.) Denmark in the Early Iron Age. Illustrated by recent Discoveries in the Peat-Mosses of Slesvig. 33 Plates (giving representations of upwards of a thousand objects), Maps, and numerous other Illustrations on wood. 4to, cloth. 31*s.* 6*d.*

Ethica; or, the Ethics of Reason. By Scotus Novanticus. 8vo, cloth. 6*s.*

—— vide Metaphysica Nova et Vetusta.

Evans (George) An Essay on Assyriology. By George Evans, M.A., Hibbert Fellow. Published for the Hibbert Trustees. With 4to Tables of Assyrian Inscriptions. 8vo, cloth. 5*s.*

Evolution of Christianity, The. By Charles Gill. Second Edition, with Dissertations in answer to Criticism. 8vo, cloth. 12*s.*

Ewald's (Dr. H.) Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament. Translated by the Rev. J. F. Smith. Complete in 5 vols. Vol. I. General Introduction, Yoel, Amos, Hosea and Zakharya 9—11. Vol. II. Yesaya, Obadya and Mikha. Vol. III. Nahûm, Ssephanya, Habaqqûq, Zachârya, Yéremya. Vol. IV. Hezekiel, Yesaya xl.—lxvi. Vol. V. and last, Haggai, Zakharya, Malaki, Jona, Baruc, Daniel, Appendix and Index. 8vo, cloth. 5 vols. Each 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— **Commentary on the Psalms.** Translated by the Rev. E. Johnson, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. Each 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— **Commentary on the Book of Job,** with Translation. Translated from the German by the Rev. J. Frederick Smith. 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Frankfurter (Dr. O.) Handbook of Pali; being an Elementary Grammar, a Chrestomathy, and a Glossary. 8vo, cloth. 16*s.*

Fuerst (Dr. Jul.) Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament. 4th Edition, improved and enlarged. Translated by Rev. Dr. Samuel Davidson. Royal 8vo, cloth. 21*s.*

—— Kept also half-bound morocco. 26*s.*

Goldschmidt (H. E.) German Poetry; with the English Versions of the best Translators. Poems of Goethe, Schiller, Freiligrath, Bürger, Heine, Uhland, Körner, &c. &c. Translated by Carlyle, Anster, Blackie, Sir Th. Martin, Shelley, Lord Ellesmere, Lord Lytton, Coleridge, Longfellow, Edgar Bowring, Garnett, &c. 8vo, cloth. 5*s.*

Gostwick (J.) and R. Harrison. Outlines of German Literature. Dedicated to Thos. Carlyle. New Edition. 8vo. 10*s.*

Gotch (Rev. Dr. J. W.) Codex Cottonianus. A Supplement to Tischendorf's Fragments in the Monumenta Sacra. Together with a Synopsis of the Codex. Facsimile. 4to, cloth. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Gould (Rev. S. Baring) Lost and Hostile Gospels. An Account of the Toledoth Jesher, two Hebrew Gospels circulating in the Middle Ages, and extant Fragments of the Gospels of the first Three Centuries of Petrine and Pauline Origin. Crown 8vo, cloth. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Hanson (Sir R. D.) The Apostle Paul and the Preaching of Christianity in the Primitive Church. By Sir R. D. Hanson, Chief Justice of South Australia, Author of "The Jesus of History," &c. 8vo, cloth. (Published at 12*s.*) 7*s.* 6*d.*

Hardy (R. Spence) Manual of Buddhism in its Modern Development. Translated from Cingalese MSS. 2nd Edition, with a complete Index and Glossary 8vo, cloth. 21*s.*

—— **Eastern [Buddhist] Monachism;** an Account of the Origin, Laws, Discipline, Sacred Writings, &c. &c. of the Order of Mendicants founded by Gotama Buddha. 8vo, cloth. 12*s.*

Hariri. The Assemblies of Al Hariri. Translated from the Arabic, with an Introduction and Notes. Vol. I. Introduction and the first Twenty-six Assemblies. By T. Chenery, Esq. 8vo, cloth. 10*s.*

Hausrath. History of the New Testament Times. The Time of Jesus. By Dr. A. Hausrath, Professor of Theology, Heidelberg. Translated by the Revds. C. T. Poynting and P. Quenzer. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 21*s.*

Hemans (Chas. I.) Historic and Monumental Rome. A Handbook for the Students of Classical and Christian Antiquities in the Italian Capital. Crown 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— **History of Mediæval Christianity and Sacred Art in Italy (A.D. 900—1500).** 2 vols. Crown 8vo, cloth. 18*s.*

Herbert (Hon. Auberon) The Party of Individual Liberty. The Right and Wrong of Compulsion by the State. Crown 8vo, cloth. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Horne (W.) Religious Life and Thought. By William Horne, M.A., Dundee, Examiner in Philosophy in the University of St. Andrews; Author of "Reason and Revelation." Crown 8vo, cloth. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Keim's History of Jesus of Nazara. Considered in its connection with the National Life of Israel, and related in detail. Translated from the German by Arthur Ransom. Vol. I. 2nd Edition. Introduction, Survey of Sources, Sacred and Political Groundwork, Religious Groundwork. Vol. II. The Sacred Youth, Self-recognition, Decision. Vol. III. The First Preaching, the Works of Jesus, the Disciples, and Apostolic Mission. Vol. IV. Conflicts and Disillusions, Strengthened Self-confidence, Last Efforts in Galilee, Signs of the approaching Fall, Recognition of the Messiah. Vol. V. The Messianic Progress to Jerusalem, The Entry into Jerusalem, The Decisive Struggle, The Farewell, The Last Supper. Vol. VI. Arrest and Pseudo-Trial, The Death on the Cross, Burial and Resurrection, The Messiah's Place in History. 8vo, cloth. Each 10*s.* 6*d.*

Kuenen (Dr. A.) The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State. Translated by A. H. May. 3 vols. 8vo. 31*s.* 6*d.*

—— **Lectures on National Religions and Universal Religions.** (Hibbert Lectures, 1882.) 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Laing and Huxley. Pre-Historic Remains of Caithness. By Samuel Laing, Esq., with Notes on the Human Remains by Th. H. Huxley, F.R.S. 150 Engravings. 8vo, cloth. 9*s.*

Lane (E. W.) Arabic-English Lexicon, derived from the best and most copious Eastern Sources. Vols. I. to VII. (to be completed in 8 vols.). Royal 4to. Each 25*s.*

—— Vol. VIII. Fasc. 1, shortly.

Latham (Dr. R. G.) Two Dissertations on the Hamlet of Saxo-Grammaticus and of Shakespear. 8vo. 5*s.*

Lepsius (C. R.) Standard Alphabet for reducing Unwritten Languages and Foreign Graphic Systems to a Uniform Orthography in European Letters. 2nd Edition. 8vo, cloth. 3*s.*

Letters to and from Rome in the Years A.D. 61, 62, and 63. Translated by C. V. S. (by Sir Richard Hanson). Crown 8vo, cloth. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Lindsay (Dr. James, M.A.) The Analytical Interpretation of the System of Divine Government of Moses. 2 vols. 12mo, cloth. 6*s.*

Linguistic Notes on some Obscure Prefixes in Greek and Latin. (4 Parts.) Crown 8vo, cloth. 6*s.* 6*d.*

Macan (R. W.) The Resurrection of Jesus Christ. An Essay in three Chapters. Published for the Hibbert Trustees. 8vo, cloth. 5*s.*

Mackay (R. W.) Sketch of the Rise and Progress of Christianity. 8vo, cloth. (Published at 10*s.* 6*d.*) 6*s.*

Malan (Rev. Dr. S. C.) The Book of Adam and Eve, also called the Conflict of Adam and Eve with Satan. A Book of the early Eastern Church. Translated from the Ethiopic, with Notes from the Kufale, Talmud, Midrashim, and other Eastern works. 8vo, cloth. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Massey (Gerald) A Book of the Beginnings. Containing an Attempt to recover and reconstitute the lost Origines of the Myths and Mysteries, Types and Symbols, Religion and Language. 2 vols. Imperial 8vo, cloth. 30*s.*

—— The Natural Genesis. 2 vols. Imp. 8vo, cloth. 30*s.*

Metaphysica Nova et Vetusta: a Return to Dualism. By Scotus Novanticus. 200 pp. 8vo, cloth. 6*s.*

Milinda Panho, the. Being Dialogues between King Milinda and the Buddhist Sage Nāgasena. The Pali Text, edited by V. Trenckner. 8vo. 21*s.*

—— vide also Pali Miscellany.

Mind, a Quarterly Review of Psychology and Philosophy. Nos. 1—40. 1876-85. 8vo, each 3*s.* Annual Subscription, post free, 12*s.*

Müller (Professor Max) Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion, as illustrated by the Religions of India. (Hibbert Lectures, 1878.) 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Nibelungenlied. The Fall of the Nibelungers, otherwise the Book of Kriemhild. An English Translation by W. N. Lettsom. Crown 8vo, cloth. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Nicolson (Rev. W. M.) Classical Revision of the Greek New Testament. Tested and applied on uniform Principles, with suggested Alterations of the English Version. Crown 8vo, cloth. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Norris (E.) Assyrian Dictionary. Intended to further the Study of the Cuneiform Inscriptions of Assyria and Babylonia. Vols. I. to III. 4to, cloth. Each 28*s.*

O'Curry (Eug.) Lectures on the Social Life, Manners and Civilization of the People of Ancient Erinn. Edited, with an Introduction, by Dr. W. K. Sullivan. Numerous Wood Engravings of Arms, Ornaments, &c. 3 vols. 8vo. 42*s.*

Oldenberg (Prof. H.) Buddha, his Life, his Doctrine, and his Order. Translated by Dr. Wm. Hoey, B.C.S. 8vo. 18*s.*

—— vide Vinaya Pitakam.

Pali Miscellany, by V. Trenckner. Part I. The Introductory Part of the Milinda Panho, with an English Translation and Notes. 8vo. 4*s.*

Peill (Rev. George) The Threefold Basis of Universal Restitution. Crown 8vo, cloth. 3*s.*

Pennethorne (John) The Geometry and Optics of Ancient Architecture, illustrated by Examples from Thebes, Athens and Rome. Folio, with 56 Plates, some in colours. Half morocco. £7. 7*s.*

Perrin (R. S.) The Religion of Philosophy; or, the Unification of Knowledge. A Comparison of the chief Philosophical and Religious Systems of the World, made with a view to reducing the Categories of Thought, or the most general Terms of Existence, to a single Principle, thereby establishing a true Conception of God. 8vo, cloth. 16*s.*

Pfleiderer (O.) Paulinism: a Contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology. Translated by E. Peters. 2 vols. 8vo. 21*s.*

—— The Teaching of the Apostle Paul and its Influence on the Development of Christianity. (Hibbert Lectures, 1885.) 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— Philosophy of Religion. Translated by the Rev. Alexander Stewart, of Dundee. Vol. I. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* Vol. II. shortly.

Platonis Philebus, with Introduction, Notes and Appendix; together with a Critical Letter on the "Laws" of Plato, and a Chapter of Palæographical Remarks, by the Rev. Dr. Chas. Badham, D.D. 2nd Edition, enlarged. 8vo, cloth. 4*s.*

Platonis Euthydemus et Laches, with Critical Notes and "Epistola critica" to the Senate of the Leyden University, by the Rev. C. Badham, D.D. 8vo, cl. 4*s.*

—— **Convivium (Symposium),** with Critical Notes and an Epistola (de Platonis Legibus) to Dr. Thompson, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, by the Rev. C. Badham, D.D. 8vo, cloth. 4*s.*

Poole (Reg. L.) Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought in the Departments of Theology and Ecclesiastical Politics. 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Protestant Commentary, A Short, on the Books of the New Testament: with general and special Introductions. Edited by Professors P. W. Schmidt and F. von Holzendorff. Translated from the Third German Edition, by the Rev. F. H. Jones, B.A. 3 vols. 8vo, cloth. Each 10*s.* 6*d.*

Quarry (Rev. J.) Genesis and its Authorship. Two Dissertations. 2nd Edition, with Notice of Animadversions of the Bishop of Natal. 8vo. 12*s.*

Reliquiæ Aquitanicæ; being Contributions to the Archæology and Palæontology of Périgord and the adjoining Provinces of Southern France. By Lartet and Christy. Edited by T. Rupert Jones, F.R.S., F.G.S. 87 Plates, 3 Maps, and 130 Wood Engravings. Royal 4to, cloth. £3. 3*s.*

Renan (E.) On the Influence of the Institutions, Thought and Culture of Rome on Christianity and the Development of the Catholic Church. (Hibbert Lectures, 1880.) 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Renouf (P. le Page) Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religion of Ancient Egypt. (Hibbert Lectures, 1879.) 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Reville (Dr. Alb.) Prolegomena of the History of Religions. By Albert Réville, D.D., Professor in the Collége de France, and Hibbert Lecturer. With an Introduction by Professor F. Max Müller. 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Reville (Rev. Dr. A.) On the Native Religions of Mexico and Peru. Translated by the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed. (Hibbert Lectures, 1884.) 8vo, cl. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— **The Song of Songs,** commonly called the Song of Solomon, or the Canticle. Crown 8vo, cloth. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Sadi. The Gulistan (Rose-Garden) of Shaik Sadi of Shiraz. A new Edition of the Persian Text, with a Vocabulary, by F. Johnson. Square royal 8vo, cloth. 15*s.*

Samuelson (James) Views of the Deity, Traditional and Scientific: a Contribution to the Study of Theological Science. Crown 8vo, cloth. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Savage (Rev. M. J.) Beliefs about the Bible. By the Rev. M. J. Savage, of the Unity Church, Boston, Mass., Author of "Belief in God," "Beliefs about Man," &c. 8vo, cloth. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Schmidt (A.) Shakespeare Lexicon. A complete Dictionary of all the English Words, Phrases, and Constructions in the Works of the Poet. 2 vols. Imp. 8vo, cloth. 34*s.*

Schrader (Prof. E.) The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament. Translated by the Rev. O. C. Whitehouse. Vol. I. With a Map. 8vo, cl. 10*s.* 6*d.* Vol. II. shortly.

Schurman (J. G.) Kantian Ethics and the Ethics of Evolution. A Critical Study. (Published by the Hibbert Trustees.) 8vo, cloth. 5*s.*

Seth (A.) The Development from Kant to Hegel, with Chapters on the Philosophy of Religion. (Published by the Hibbert Trustees.) 8vo, cloth. 5*s.*

Sharpe (Samuel) History of the Hebrew Nation and its Literature. With an Appendix on the Hebrew Chronology. 4th Edition, 487 pp. 8vo, cl. 7*s.* 6*d.*

—— **Hebrew Inscriptions** from the Valleys between Egypt and Mount Sinai, in their Original Characters, with Translations and an Alphabet. 2 Parts. 20 Plates. 8vo, cloth. 7*s.* 6*d.*

—— vide also Bible, and Testament.

Smith (Rev. J. F.) Studies in Religion under German Masters. Essays on Herder, Goethe, Lessing, Frank, and Lang. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5*s.*

—— vide Ewald's Prophets and Job.

Sophocles. The Greek Text critically revised, with the aid of MSS., newly collated and explained. By Rev. F. H. M. Blaydes. I. Philoctetes. II. Trachiniæ. III. Electra. IV. Ajax. 8vo, cloth. Each 6*s.*

Spencer (Herbert) First Principles. 5th Thousand, with an Appendix. 8vo. 16*s.*

—— The Principles of Biology. 2 vols. 8vo. 34*s.*

—— The Principles of Psychology. 4th Thousand. 2 vols. 8vo. 36*s.*

—— The Principles of Sociology. Vol. I. 21*s.*

—— Ceremonial Institutions. (Principles of Sociology, Vol. II. Part 1.) 8vo. 7*s.*

—— Political Institutions. (Principles of Sociology, Vol. II. Part 2.) 8vo. 12*s.*

—— Ecclesiastical Institutions. (Principles of Sociology, Vol. II. Part 3.) 5*s.*

—— The Data of Ethics. Being the First Portion of the Principles of Ethics. 8vo, cloth. 8*s.*

—— The Study of Sociology. Library Edition (being the 9th), with a Postscript. 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical. 8vo, cloth. 6*s.*

—— The same, cheaper Edition, 4th Thousand. 12mo, cloth. 2*s.* 6*d.*

—— Essays: Scientific, Political, and Speculative. (Being the First and Second Series re-arranged, and containing an additional Essay.) 2 vols. 4th Thousand. 8vo, cloth. 16*s.*

—— Essays. (Third Series.) Including the Classification of the Sciences. 3rd Edition. 8vo. 8*s.*

—— The Man *versus* the State. Paper covers, 1*s.*; better paper, cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

—— The Philosophy of M. Comte—Reasons for Dissenting from it. 6*d.*

—— Descriptive Sociology, or Groups of Sociological Facts. Compiled and abstracted by Professor D. Duncan, of Madras, Dr. Richard Sheppig, and James Collier. Folio, boards. No. 1. English, 18*s.* No. 2. Ancient American Races, 16*s.* No. 3. Lowest Races, Negritto Races, Polynesians, 18*s.* No. 4. African Races, 16*s.* No. 5. Asiatic Races, 18*s.* No. 6. American Races, 18*s.* No. 7. Hebrews and Phœnicians, 21*s.* No. 8. The French Civilization, 30*s.*

Spinoza. Four Essays by Professors Land, Van Vloten, and Kuno Fischer, and by E. Renan. Edited by Professor Knight, of St. Andrews. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5*s.*

Stephens (George) Old Northern Runic Monuments of Scandinavia and England, now first collected and deciphered. Numerous Engravings on Wood and 15 Plates. Vols. I.—III. Folio. Each 50*s.*

—— Handbook of old Northern Runic Monuments of Scandinavia and England. Abridged from the larger Work, retaining all the Illustrations. Royal 4to. 40*s.*

—— Thunor the Thunderer, carved on a Scandinavian Font about the year 1000. 4to. 6*s.*

Stokes (Geo. J.) The Objectivity of Truth. 8vo, cloth. 5*s.*

Stokes (Whitley) Old Irish Glossaries. Cormac's Glossary. O'Davoran's Glossary. A Glossary to the Calendar of Oingus the Culdee. Edited, with an Introduction and Index. 8vo, cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— Middle-Breton Hours. Edited, with a Translation and Glossary. 8vo, boards. 6*s.*

—— The Creation of the World. A Mystery in Ancient Cornish. Edited, with Translations and Notes. 8vo, cloth. 6*s.*

Strauss (Dr. D. F.) Life of Jesus for the People. The Authorized English Edition. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 24*s.*

Sullivan (W. K.) Celtic Studies, from the German of Dr. Hermann Ebel, with an Introduction on the Roots, Stems and Derivatives, and on Case-endings of Nouns in the Indo-European Languages. 8vo, cloth. 10*s.*

Taine (H.) English Positivism. A Study of John Stuart Mill. Translated by T. D. Haye. Crown 8vo, cloth. 3*s.*

Tayler (Rev. John James) An Attempt to ascertain the Character of the Fourth Gospel, especially in its relation to the first Three. 2nd Edition. 8vo, cl. 5*s.*

Testament, The New. Translated by S. Sharpe, Author of "The History of Egypt," &c. 14th Thousand. Fcap. 8vo, cloth. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Thoughts (365) for Every Day in the Year. Selected from the Writings of Spiritually-minded Persons. By the Author of "Visiting my Relations." Printed with red lines. Crown 8vo, cl. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Turpie (Dr. D. McC.) The Old Testament in the New. The Quotations from the Old Testament in the New classified according to their Agreement with or Variation from the Original: the various Readings and Versions of the Passages, Critical Notes. Royal 8vo, cloth. 12*s.*

—— Manual of the Chaldee Language: containing Grammar of the Biblical Chaldee and of the Targums, a Chrestomathy, Selections from the Targums, with a Vocabulary. Square 8vo, cl. 7*s.*

Vinaya Pitakam: one of the principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures. Edited in Pali by Dr. H. Oldenberg. In 5 vols. 8vo. Each 21*s.*

Williams (Rev. Dr. Rowland) The Hebrew Prophets, during the Assyrian and Babylonian Empires. Translated afresh from the Original, with regard to the Anglican Version, with Illustrations for English Readers. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 22*s.* 6*d.*

—— Psalms and Litanies, Counsels and Collects, for Devout Persons. Edited by his Widow. Fcap. 4to, cloth extra. 12*s.* 6*d.*

—— Broadchalke Sermon-Essays on Nature, Mediation, Atonement, Absolution, &c. Crown 8vo, cloth. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Wright (G. H. B.) The Book of Job. A new critically revised Translation, with Essays on Scansion, Date, &c. By G. H. Bateson Wright, M.A., Queen's Coll., Oxford, Head Master of the Government Central School, Hong Kong. 8vo, cloth. 6*s.*

Zeller (Dr. E.) The Contents and Origin of the Acts of the Apostles critically investigated. Preceded by Dr. Fr. Overbeck's Introduction to the Acts of the Apostles from De Wette's Handbook. Translated by Joseph Dare. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 21*s.*

WILLIAMS & NORGATE have published the following Catalogues of their Stock.

1. Classical Catalogue. Greek and Latin Classics.
2. Theological Catalogue. Including Philosophy and Metaphysics.
3. French Catalogue. General Literature, History, Travels, &c.
4. German Catalogue. General Literature.
* Map Catalogue. Foreign Maps and Atlases.
5. Linguistic Catalogue. European Languages.
* Italian Catalogue.
* Spanish Catalogue.
6. Oriental Catalogue. Oriental Languages and Literature.
7. Medical Catalogue. Medicine, Surgery, &c.
8. Natural History Catalogue. Zoology, Botany, Geology, Palæontology.
9. Natural Science Catalogue. Mathematics, Astronomy, Physics, Mechanics, Chemistry, &c.
10. Art Catalogue. Architecture, Painting, Sculpture and Engraving. Books illustrated by Artists.
11. School Catalogue. Elementary Books, Maps, &c.

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY
3 1197 21057 1243

WIDDISON,
BOOKSELLER,
STATIONER & PRINTER,
14, Fargate,
SHEFFIELD.